Durham E-Theses

Eschatology and the Risen Lord: Mary and the Dialogue Gospel Genre

PARKHOUSE, SARAH,JANE

How to cite:

Use policy

Eschatology and the Risen Lord: *Mary* and the Dialogue Gospel Genre

Sarah Parkhouse

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at Durham University to the Department of Theology and Religion

2017

Eschatology and the Risen Lord: *Mary* and the Dialogue Gospel Genre

Abstract

The dialogue gospel was a popular literary genre in early Christianity. Texts include the *Apocryphon of John,* the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Epistula Apostolurum,* all which depict the risen Christ appearing to select disciples and answering a series of questions on life, death and the cosmos. The revelation in dialogue gospels can vary greatly (from affirming the resurrection of the flesh to denying it completely), yet each text is based on the premise that their gospel contains new or clarified teaching from the risen or glorified Lord, often seen as a final revelation concerned with the disciples' eschatological salvation.

In Part One, I argue for an open view of genre in which disparate texts can be brought together for comparative analysis. A genre of 13 dialogue gospels is constructed as a base for examination of the genre itself, its individual texts and their literary neighbours. In chapter two, dialogue gospels are read alongside selected themes and traditions from the canonical gospels and Pauline epistles, demonstrating that they are all part of the same conceptual world. The breadth of the work in Part One sets the foundation for Part Two in which a single text is focused on: The *Gospel of Mary*. Chapter three analyzes the narrative frame of GMary, arguing that it does not just *frame* the dialogue but informs and shapes it. Chapters four and five focus on the gospel's cosmic and individual eschatology, reading it christologically. Christ has come to dissolve the material cosmos; Christ has ascended so Christian souls can follow him into Rest. At points, GMary's eschatology converges with Luke, John, GThom and 1ApocJas. The work ends with appendices with notes on how to read the MSS, texts and translations and a synopses of the Greek and Coptic recensions of GMary.

Declaration

This thesis is the product of my own work and does not include work that has been presented in any form for a degree at this or any other university. All quotation from, and references to, the work of persons other than myself have been properly acknowledged throughout.

Statement of Copyright

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abbreviations: Ancient Sources

Dialogue Gospel Titles

1ApocJas	First Apocalypse of James
ApocPet	Apocalypse of Peter (Greek/Ethiopic)
ApJas	Apocryphon of James
ApJohn	Apocryphon of John
BookThom	Book of Thomas the Contender
DialSav	Dialogue of the Saviour
EpAp	Epistula Apostolorum
EpPetPhil	Epistle of Peter to Philip
GJudas	Gospel of Judas
GMary	Gospel of Mary
John FD	The Johannine Farewell Discourse (13.31–17.1)
PistSoph	Pistis Sophia
SophJesChr	Sophia of Jesus Christ

Other Greek and Latin sources

1 Apol.	Justin, *First Apology*
ad Autol.	Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*
Adv. Haer.	Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*
Adv. Marc.	Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*
c. Cels.	Origen, *Contra Celsum*
Dial.	Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*
Did.	*Didache*
Ep. Flora	Ptolemy, *Epistle to Flora*
Exc. Theod.	Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*
Ep. Trall.	Ignatius, *Epistle to the Trallians*
GPet	*Gospel of Peter*
Her.	Philo, *Heir of the Divine Goods*

Hist. Eccl.	Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
Or. Graec.	Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*
Ref.	Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium (Philosophoumena)*
Paed.	Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*
Pan.	Epiphanius, *Panarion*
Phaed.	Plato, *Phaedo*
Phaedr.	Plato, *Phaedrus*
POxy.GM	Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3525 (the *Gospel of Mary*)
PRyl.GM	Papyrus Rylands 463 (the *Gospel of Mary*)
Strom.	Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*
Tim.	Plato, *Timaeus*
Vit. Phil	Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*

Other Coptic sources

2ApocJas	Second Apocalypse of James
ActPet12	Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles
ApocPaul	Apocalypse of Paul
AuthTeach	Authoritative Teaching
ApocPet$_{COP}$	Apocalypse of Peter (Coptic)
BG	Berlin Codex
CT	Codex Tchacos
Eug	Eugnostos
ExegSoul	Exegesis on the Soul
GPhil	Gospel of Philip
GThom	Gospel of Thomas
HypArch	Hypostasis of the Archons
NHC 1–13	Nag Hammadi Codices
OrigWorld	On the Origin of the World
SentSext	Sentences of Sextus
Zost	Zostrianos

Abbreviations: Modern Sources

AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
BCNH:E	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi: Études
BCNH:T	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi: Textes
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
CGL	Coptic Gnostic Library
EC	*Early Christianity*
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JR	*The Journal of Religion*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSupp	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies (formerly NHS)
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSupp	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature

Introduction

The earliest Christians penned stories that narrate Jesus conversing with one or more of his disciples, immediately before his passion or after his resurrection. A number of these texts survive today. In these 'dialogue gospels', Jesus answers the disciples' questions, which are typically centred around the three following issues: how they are to deal with life in his absence, where he intends to go when he leaves them, and how they might follow him there. The *Gospel of Mary* is one example of a dialogue gospel. In this fragmentary text, Jesus answers questions put to him by individual disciples, and in a 'farewell discourse' immediately before his departure he issues his final instructions. Despite his instructions, the male disciples cannot cope with his departure; they weep in fear that they will be persecuted if they fulfil his command to preach to the nations. At this point Mary comes to the fore, comforts them and explains how their souls can reach eschatological salvation. Her story does not allay their fears; Peter and Andrew refuse to believe Mary, and Levi must step in to remind them all of Jesus' last instructions.

The form of Jesus answering questions from his disciples finds its companions across a range of texts, from the Johannine farewell discourse (13.31–17.1) to the *Epistula Apostolorum* to *Pistis Sophia*. 13 texts have been selected to construct our genre of 'dialogue gospels', each converging at two main points: (1) Jesus as the central character, and (2) dialogue with one or more disciples. All but one of our texts has been brought to light by a series of manuscript discoveries.[1] The dialogue gospels share the same goal as the canonical gospels: it is intended that their readers/hearers will come to a fuller understanding of their salvation, which is through Jesus. Where the canonical gospels primarily narrate the life and

---

[1] The texts in view are as follows, in order of their years of discovery and publication: *Pistis Sophia* (PistSoph), 1772/1848; the *Apocalypse of Peter* (ApocPet), Greek 1886–87/1892, Ethiopic publ. 1910; the *Epistula Apostolorum* (EpAp), Coptic c. 1895/1919, Ethiopic publ. 1912; the *Gospel of Mary* (GMary: Berlin Gnostic Codex = BG 8502,1), 1896/1955; the *Apocryphon of John* (ApJohn: BG 8502,2 [+ Nag Hammadi Codices = NHC 2,1, 3,1, 4,1]), 1896/1955; the *Sophia* (or *Wisdom) of Jesus Christ* (SophJesChr: BG 8502,3 [+ NHC 3,4]), 1896/1955; the *First Apocalypse of James* (1ApocJas: NHC 5,3 [+ Codex Tchacos = CT 2]), 1945/1979 the *Apocryphon of James* (ApJas: NHC 1,2), 1945/1985; the *Book of Thomas* (BookThom: NHC 2,7), 1945/1989; the *Dialogue of the Saviour* (DialSav: NHC 3,5), 1945/1984; the *Epistle of Peter to Philip* (EpPetPhil: NHC 8,2 [= CT 1]), 1945/1991; the *Gospel of Judas* (GJudas: CT 3), publ. 2006. Also included here within the dialogue gospel genre is the Johannine Farewell Discourse (John FD). Except where specified above, the twelve non-canonical texts are extant only in Coptic, although Greek fragments have been found of GMary (POxy 3525, PRyl 463) and SophJesChr (POxy 1081), as well as a Latin fragment of EpAp preserved in a palimpsest (Cod. Vind. 16). The selection of these texts will be justified in chapter 1.

death of Jesus, dialogue gospels narrate his final revelations as the risen or glorified Christ. In one sense, the preference for Jesus as *risen* Saviour comes closer to Paul than to the Synoptics; but the dialogue format and the narrative context place them straight into the 'gospel' genre.[2]

These 'dialogue gospels' may be grouped together to construct a genre, but they hardly form a homogeneous whole, varying considerably in setting, characters, length and treatment of their subject matter. They may be set before the risen Jesus ascends (BookThom), or before he is crucified (GJudas). The revelation may be directed to one privileged disciple (ApJohn), or two (ApJas), or to a larger group of twelve apostles and seven women (SophJesChr). The text may confirm the authority of the Twelve, with Peter as leader (EpPetPhil), or profess that salvation will only come through a future generation (ApJas). They may be concise, with only a few queries from the disciples (John FD), or they may be so long that Jesus himself gets annoyed with the disciples' relentless and repetitive requests for knowledge (EpAp). What they have in common is Jesus as revealer, answering the questions of the disciple(s) who are concerned that they lack the knowledge they need. Dialogue gospels also vary in content and theological persuasion. They may narrate a tour of the heavenly realms and their corresponding initiation-mysteries (PistSoph), or a tour of the regions of hell where different sins receive their corresponding punishments (ApocPet). Their agenda may be to promote asceticism due to the corrupt nature of the material world (BookThom) or to confirm the corporeality of the resurrected body (EpAp). They may profess that the material realm is the work of an ignorant demiurge (ApJohn) or they may acknowledge the highest Father as the creator (DialSav).

The dialogue gospels reflect the complex and diverse literary landscape of emerging Christianity. Traditionally, texts found at Nag Hammadi were labelled 'gnostic', stemming from the non-Christian religion of 'Gnosticism' and at best superficially christianized, while the firmly Christian EpAp was seen as borrowing the dialogue gospel genre to combat those heretical 'gnostics' who created it.[3] However, the concept of 'gnosticism' has changed.

---

[2] I here follow Tuckett and Gregory in what they deem a 'looser' definition of the term 'gospel' as referring to 'a text which purports to give information about the life and teaching of Jesus', Andrew Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, 'Series Preface', in Tuckett, ed. *Gospel of Mary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), vi. On this definition, a text may be a 'gospel' (or gospel-like) even if its ancient or modern readers view it as an apocalypse, apocryphon, epistle or gospel.

[3] For an example, a binary opposition between two competing religions is implied in the title of Birger A. Pearson's book, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004). According to Klauck, EpAp 'has a special place among the dialogue gospels: its author has borrowed its

Almost all scholars who engage with non-canonical early Christian texts provide an obligatory nod towards the acceptance that the labels of 'gnostic' and 'gnosticism' need nuancing (whether or not they think that they should be used). The deconstruction of the term and so-called religion of 'gnosticism' led by Williams and King, now over twenty years old, has prevailed in most quarters, and their work has resulted in a backlash against those who hold dear the rigorous bifurcation of orthodoxy and gnosticism.[4] It is now more common to talk of trajectories of early Christianities, of which 'gnosticism' represents just one.[5] Yet, there is still a sense that 'gnosticism' is something different to Christianity proper, something that can be separated from it and pinned down as its own thing. And consequently the 'gnostic' dialogue gospels will be assumed to share basically the same 'gnostic' ideology, to be at odds from their 'proto-orthodox' counterparts, and to depict a Jesus who is fundamentally different to the Jesus of the New Testament.

Yet we do not see in the dialogue gospels any such ideology. Those once called 'gnostic' share as much in common with their 'orthodox' neighbours as with each other, with many points of both similarity and difference. The genre itself is thoroughly diverse, and it is this diversity that make the texts good conversation partners. By putting dialogue gospels into conversation with each other and with NT texts, I hope to continue to blur any sort of remaining bifurcation. To make the case, I shall develop an 'open' view of genre – one that recognizes both the fluidity of ancient generic categories and the role of the modern scholar in constructing the genre that suits their own concerns. Such a view can bring together a variety of texts for comparative analysis, whether they are within the genre or a literary neighbour. In the case of dialogue gospels, their closest companions are naturally canonical gospels, with which they share the same characters and content even if these are interpreted radically differently. The act of comparing and contrasting can help refine our understanding of the dialogue gospel genre, the intertextual relationships between dialogue gospels and NT texts, and the individual texts themselves.

The category of dialogue gospels – what it is, which texts belong in this genre, and why an author might write one – is the subject of Part One. Chapter one looks specifically at

---

genre from his gnostic opponents and turned it into a useful weapon against them', Hans-Josef Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction*. Trans. McNeil (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 159.

[4] Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking 'Gnosticism': An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); Karen L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005). More recently David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[5] This concept has been heavily influenced by James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

the genre itself and its creation of a new category of early Christian texts in which Jesus engages in dialogue with his disciples. Previous genre definitions have varied widely, both in what to call it and in which texts are to be included in it, and the taxonomies always suit the interest of the scholar delimiting them. The present work builds on the monographs of Perkins and Hartenstein, among others, who also investigate dialogue gospels but from the viewpoint of 'gnostic' theology or their narrative frame.[6] I aim to show that the dialogue gospel form does not intrinsically share a link to 'gnosticism'; that the narrative frame and dialogue are not two separate entities superficially glued together (this is certainly not the case in GMary); and that the dialogical form is a fitting vehicle for eschatological revelation.

Chapter two builds on this open categorization of dialogue gospels, asking what might have inspired an early Christian author to write one, and reading the texts alongside literature that came to be (or had already been) accorded 'canonical' status. Dialogue gospels have strong and varied intertextual links to the canonical gospels and Pauline epistles, and their shared themes are the subject of this chapter. For the purpose of drawing out these intertextual links, themes have been selected from Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, John and Pauline epistles, and the differences and similarities with selected dialogue gospels discussed. An example of this is the theme of mission shared by Matt 28.19–20, GMary and EpPetPhil, among others. In Matthew, the evangelist does not narrate how the disciples go about enacting this command or how they feel about it. GMary and EpPetPhil fill this gap in the narrative by highlighting the disciples' fear of persecution following Jesus' command to preach. As this small-scale example illustrates, a major reason for the composition of later texts in dialogue format was to address perceived deficiencies in earlier gospel literature. By using this comparative approach, chapter two also takes the opportunity for further exegesis on the dialogue gospels themselves.

Whereas the first two chapters cover a wide breadth of dialogue gospels and their intertextual links, Part Two takes an in-depth look at GMary. GMary is unique among the dialogue gospels in the extent to which the narrative frame is integrated into the dialogue. Unusually this gospel extends well beyond the departure of Jesus, and the ensuing narrative and dialogue are premised on the new reality of Jesus' absence.[7] It is because of his departure

---

[6] Pheme Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980); Judith Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*, TU 146 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000).

[7] In EpPetPhil and GJudas, Jesus departs but reappears or continues to speak. In GMary, Jesus reappears only indirectly, in the form of Mary explaining her memories of Jesus.

that the disciples worry about being persecuted and quarrel over his words, and it is for the same reason that Mary can come to the fore and explain his eschatological journey and how they can follow him.

Chapter three focuses on the narrative frame. In this chapter, I explore possibilities for the missing six pages of the Berlin Codex that form the beginning of GMary, firmly situating it within the dialogue gospel genre. The extant narrative frame is then divided into three parts: The Saviour's farewell discourse that leads to his final departure, Mary's intervention, and the subsequent breach between the disciples and its possible healing. I will argue that the Saviour's farewell discourse encourages the disciples to be active participants in the Christian message of salvation. They must procure Jesus' peace, they are warned against waiting for an apocalyptic Son of Man, and instead they must find Christ within. They are told to preach the gospel and banned from imposing new laws of their own devising. Once Jesus has gone, the disciples are left with Mary to comfort them. The section on Mary's intervention focuses on two features of the text's depiction of her character: her relationship with the male disciples and her relationship with Jesus. Attention to the differences between the Greek (POxy 3525; PRyl 463) and Coptic (BG) versions of (parts of) GMary indicate that the Coptic recension heightens antagonism and disunity between Mary and the men. Mary's relationship to Jesus, on the other hand, is one of unity, and I argue that Mary takes on a kind of Paraclete role as she 'rises' only as Jesus departs, and she teaches and comforts the other disciples.

The final part of the narrative frame sees the disciples split into two factions, with Mary and Levi on one side and Peter and Andrew on the other. The split is the result of Mary's recollection of the ascent of the Soul. Andrew and Peter will not accept this teaching as it is not consistent with what they know of Jesus and because Jesus revealed it to Mary alone. They condemn Mary's revelation as heresy. By challenging Mary, Peter is cast as an adversary akin to the hostile cosmic powers that attempt to prevent the Soul from attaining her eschatological Rest. The text gives Levi the last words, and he reminds them all of the Saviour's teaching in his farewell discourse. GMary concludes with the enactment of Jesus' command to preach – although in the Greek Rylands papyrus, Levi preaches alone, whereas in the Coptic MS, there is an ambiguous '*they* departed to preach'. If the narrative frame of the Coptic GMary creates greater tension between the male disciples and Mary, does the 'they' allow for a greater reconciliation between the two parties, or does 'they' refer to Mary and Levi and thus rule out reconciliation altogether? This is explored in light of other textual evidence, especially PistSoph.

There are two sets of eschatological teachings in GMary – the dissolution of Matter, revealed to the group by the Saviour, and the ascent of the Soul, revealed alone to Mary who then recounts it to the group. These themes are the focus of chapters four and five. The cosmic eschatology of GMary is essentially that the created heavens and earth will be restored through dissolution into its original constituent parts. This presupposes a cosmology in which Matter is the raw material of the cosmos and has been moulded into the composite created entities called in GMary 'every nature, every form, every creature'. This cosmology does not imply an inferior-demiurgic creator deity, and the author's view of the contingent nature of the material world is shared between many second-century Christian thinkers, including Justin and Irenaeus, and situates GMary firmly within a Christian context. Chapter four firstly deals with the cosmological makeup of matter, nature, form and creature, and then argues that dissolution must occur because humanity lives under sin and death because of its enslavement to passion. This is essentially a Pauline view. I then discuss the christological reading of 'the Good' as the instigator of the cosmic eschaton, and how this relates to the 'Son of Man', which Jesus proclaims as living within the disciples. The Son of Man in GMary contradicts a Parousia theology, in which Christ will come again to judge and destroy the world. But the Son of Man is still Christ – just as he can live within his disciples in Paul and John, he lives within his disciples in GMary. There is no expectation of a future external figure, nor need there be one: with Christ's coming, the end time has begun. The Son of Man is within. The Good dissolves the cosmos. Christ is both.

Chapter five explores the individual eschatology of GMary, which is narrated through the ascent of the individual and paradigmatic Soul to its heavenly Rest. I will argue that the anonymous Soul is in the first instance Jesus himself: It is the ascension of John 20.17. Yet, it can also be the disciple's Soul. The Soul must ascend past malevolent archons who challenge her, and by declaring her heavenly origins she can overcome them and return home. In 1ApocJas, we see that Jesus' ascension past fearsome archons paves the way for James to follow, and at the time of James' own ascension he must profess his own heavenly ancestry to these archons (cf. GThom 50). The comparable scheme in GMary extends the ascension reference in John 20.17 to the disciple's salvation.

The characterization of Mary here suggests that she has already (partly) followed Jesus into eternal Rest. At the culmination of the ascent, Mary mirrors the Soul in her silence. She is called 'blessed', the Saviour loves her more than the other disciples and she receives private revelation from him. She does not appear to be under the influence of passions, sin

and death. I propose that in GMary Rest can be partly-realized in the present Christian experience, much like the Johannine eternal life, and fully attained after death.

Part One

Chapter One

What is a Dialogue Gospel? Defining a Genre

Dialogue gospels do not exist in isolation. They are part of the wider network of literary texts and traditions that shaped Christianity. They share a number of intertextual motifs with the canonical gospels, and at points converge with early Christian thinkers such as Ignatius and Clement, in spite of radically different theological views.[1] Our purpose here is to construct a genre as a starting point to find such connections that will point to other texts within the genre itself but also to those outside of it. And so, 13 texts have been focused on under the premise that to be a dialogue gospel, a text must contain two things: (1) Jesus on the verge of departure, and (2) dialogue with one or more of his disciples.

Dialogue gospels are called a variety of different things and each name is indicative of the texts scholars wish to include within that genre. Sometimes they are called 'resurrection dialogues', which confines the genre to dialogues with the risen Lord. These might include ApJohn, SophJesChr and EpAp, among others. Sometimes the group's title is prefixed with the label 'gnostic', and so will exclude EpAp and ApocPet (and arguably ApJas). A more inclusive group of texts might be called 'dialogue gospels', expanding the group to include farewell discourses, such as DialSav, John FD and GJudas, alongside resurrection dialogues of any theological persuasion. This chapter will discuss how previous scholarship has construed the genre, and ask what work the construction of a genre can do for us.[2] I will then propose a genre of 'dialogue gospels', which comprises:

> i.   *Apocryphon of John*
> ii.   *Johannine Farewell Discourse*
> iii. *Epistle of Peter to Philip*

---

[1] Every mention of Clement in this work refers to Clement of Alexandria.

[2] See the table below. The differences in the collections have been noted by e.g. Petersen: 'Diese Zusammenstellung macht deutlich, daß die Zuordnung einer Schrift zur Gattung des gnostishcen Dialogs keineswegs eindeutig ist', Silke Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit! Maria Magdalena, Salome and andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften*, NHMS 48 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 37. Dettwiler also notes: 'Die Texte, die von der Forschung zur Gattung des gnostischen Dialogs des Erlösers resp. des gnostischen Offenbarungsdialogs gerechnet werden, sind weder formal noch inhaltlich streng einheitlich. So werden bspw. je nachdem, ob die Dialogstruktur als konstitutiv für eine Schrift angesehen wird oder nur eine spätere literarische Einkleidung einer ursprünglich nichtdialogischen Schrift darstellt, unterschiedlich viele Texte dieser Gattung zugerechnet', Andreas Dettwiler, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten: eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31–16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 22.

Finally in this chapter, I will note how the theme keys of revelation, the revealer and eschatology are conceived in comparable ways within these 13 texts.

1.1. 'Gnostic Dialogues' and 'Dialogevangelien'

1.1.1. *The Literature*

Few scholars have looked at dialogue gospels in their entirety, and those that have have reached no consensus regarding what they are (genre) or which texts should be included. The two main studies on these dialogues as a 'genre' are Perkins' *The Gnostic Dialogue* and Hartenstein's *Die zweite Lehre*.[3] Perkins includes only those that she considers 'gnostic' and Hartenstein includes only those that contain a narrative frame. Although different interests predominate, both studies build their categories and analysis from earlier scholarship, which tended to hold a rigid view of both genre and 'gnosticism'. To my knowledge, since 'gnosticism' as a category has been dismantled or nuanced, no major study on the 'dialogue gospel' genre has been published.[4] It is unfortunate that past scholarship categorizes the texts we are dealing with as 'gnostic' (or 'anti-gnostic' in the case of EpAp). It is much more useful to see the genre as made up of individual texts that represent divergent theologies, christologies, eschatologies, and so forth.

---

[3] Pheme Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980); Judith Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge* TU 146 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000).

[4] Much of the scholarship before Williams and King's works understands dialogue gospels in terms of non-Christian traditions woven into a Christian narrative framework. For example, Meyer states that EpPetPhil has 'baptized these [non-Christian] traditions as revelatory utterances of the risen Christ', Marvin W. Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, SBLDS 53 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 122. In the last 20 years, English-speaking scholars working on texts that were once classified as 'gnostic' have become more nuanced and qualify their use of these categories.

Two decades after the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices in 1945, work was being published on this 'dialogue gospel' genre, which included several texts from the NHC alongside texts from related codices. Much of the earlier work from the late 1960s to the 1980s stressed identifying literary genres, proposing structural similarities between texts, and then deciding on the antecedent genre. In 1968, Rudolph raised the question of the 'gnostic dialogue' as a literary genre, understanding these texts as an independent literary form developed out of older styles such as *erotapokriseis* and Platonic dialogues.[5] The texts he considers are ApJohn, GMary, ApocPaul, 1ApocJas, SophJesChr, PistSoph and 2Jeu (and the Manichaean *Kephalaia*). He constructs the genre by identifying features typical to the texts, including the following: the teacher-revealer is the exalted Christ; the students are the apostles; the teacher-student relationship is frozen in a 'Frage-Antwort-Schema'; there is no discussion with opponents; the aim is not primarily polemical but to serve its own 'Sitz im Leben'; the content is often concerned with exegetical questions; and the characters are fictional 'ohne Fleisch und Blut'.[6] Mary Magdalene is by far the most popular disciple, appearing 69 times (followed by Peter appearing 7 times as a not-so-close second). Within the dialogues, Rudolph sees the characteristics as:

> die wiederholte Forderung nach Aufmerksamkeit,
> die eingangs gegebene Selbstprädikation,
> die Tröstung der durch sein Erscheinen erschreckten Jünger,
> der Lob besonders gut gestellter Fragen oder Antworten,

---

[5] Kurt Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus', in *Probleme der koptischen Literatur*, ed. Peter Nagel (Halle: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge der Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1968), esp. 89. Revelation dialogues have continued to be associated with *erotapokriseis* literature, and the question has recently been addressed in a collection of essays from a 2013 volume. Kaler argues against the tendency to link revelatory dialogues too closely to *erotapokriseis* literature as it will overemphasize only one aspect of the revelation dialogue, Michael Kaler, 'Just How Close Are the Gnostic Revelation Dialogues to Erotapokriseis Literature, Anyway?', in *La littérature des Questions et Réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse*, ed. Marie-Pierre Bussières, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64 (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013), 37–49. Piovanelli shows that these are traditions that are in transition and are not static, Pierluigi Piovanelli, 'Entre oralité et (ré)écriture: Le modèle des erotapokriseis dans les dialogues Apocryphes de Nag Hammadi', in *Questions et Réponses*, 93–103. In the same volume, Edwards argues that 1ApocJas 'is not representative of our concept of *erotapokriseis*' as the dialogue is not intended to be didactic or exegetical, and is not a one-sided conversation between teacher and student, Robert Michael Edwards, 'The Rhetoric of Authority: The Nature of Revelation in the First Apocalypse of James', in *Questions et Réponses*, 77. I would say that the conversation between James and Jesus in 1ApocJas is both didactic and exegetical and should be no more or less associated with *erotapokriseis* than other dialogue gospels. Zamagni shows that the question-and-answer pattern in early Christianity serves a number of aims and purposes, and is far from clearly defined itself, Claudio Zamagni, 'Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogeneous Group?', in *Questions et Réponses*, 241–68.

[6] Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus', 89–90.

der Vortrag ohne Gleichnisse, also offen und unverhüllt.[7]

He argues that the dialogues are written to develop doctrine and convey salvation: 'Durch diese Literaturform sucht die Gnosis sich selbst aufzuklären; sie ist Abbild dieses innergnostichen Vorgangs der Lehrbildung'.[8]

   Outlines to this effect are relatively popular in discussions about genre. Thus Puech defines 'gnostische Evangelien' as having the following features: action on a mountain and after the resurrection; appearance of the Saviour in supernatural light form; astonishment and fear from the recipients; and the dialogue beginning almost immediately. In the dialogues, the resurrected and glorified Christ bestows the highest revelation, revealing mysteries and solving the problems that the disciples are concerned about.[9] Krause suggested a simpler outline of the 'revelation dialogue' genre: (1) setting: post-resurrection; (2) question/dialogue; (3) action; (4) conclusion.[10] A different approach was taken by Koester who, instead of listing internal-textual features that define a genre, inserted dialogues into the context of sayings traditions, arguing that the dialogues are a continuation of older sayings collections and offer an interpretation of them. In doing so, he changed the scholarly conversation around these texts: instead of isolating the dialogue gospels from other gospels, he brought them into conversation.[11]

   In 1979, Fallon suggested a genre of 'gnostic apocalypses'. The new focus on 'apocalypse' rather than 'dialogue' or 'gospel' pushed him in the direction of categorizing the texts in terms of their eschatology. He created a scheme of those without (Type I) and those with (Type II) an otherworldly journey, and sub-types (i) those with cosmic eschatology and (ii) those with only personal eschatology. The apocalypses divide as:

---

[7] Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus', 92–93.

[8] Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus', 103.

[9] This is in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, eds., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Evangelien*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959), 170–71. The 1991 6th edition advises that several Nag Hammadi texts had not been available to Puech, so that we should be cautious in using his work to define this genre, W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 1, Trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson (Louisville: WJK, 1991), 354–55.

[10] Martin Krause, 'Die literarischen Gattungen der Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi', in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 621–37.

[11] Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990).

Fallon's classification of these texts as apocalypses encourages a stronger emphasis on their eschatological aspects – a topic which is often overlooked. Although his overview is introductory, for his selected texts the analysis is spot on: he argues that the emphasis is on present salvation through knowledge and eschatological salvation conceived through the ascent of the soul/divine element to the divine realm.[13] He continues:

> Occasionally, this interest is accompanied by an interest in the consummation, i.e., the dissolution of the cosmos and the return of all divine elements to the divine realm (e.g. NatArch, PS I-III, ParaShem). Obviously, there is no interest in these gnostic apocalypses in cosmic transformation at the end of time, since the cosmos is in principle evil.[14]

In actuality, this is not 'obvious', as we will see in the case of GMary in chapter four. Fallon differentiates 'gnostic revelatory dialogues' from apocalypses on the basis that in the dialogues '[t]here is no account of the appearance or departure of the revealer and thus no

---

[12] In the introduction to the *Semeia* volume on apocalypticism, Collins writes that: 'The Christian Apocryphon of James from Nag Hammadi, which is not clearly Gnostic, also conforms to this type [Apocalypses with only Personal Eschatology (and no otherworldly journey)]', John J. Collins, 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre', ed. John J. Collins, *Semeia* 14 (1979): 14. But Fallon places it under 'Christian apocalypse' rather than 'gnostic apocalypse' and so it is not placed alongside 1ApocJas, EpPetPhil, and so forth, Francis T. Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', ed. John J. Collins, *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, *Semeia* 14 (1979): 145.

[13] Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 125.

[14] Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 125. Another defining characteristic is the dualism between the evil heavens and/or their rulers (which are more developed in later works, such as PistSoph) and the divine realm above them (126).

clear presentation of Jesus as a transcendent mediator as in the gnostic apocalypses'.[15] The 'revelatory dialogues' are GThom, BookThom, DialSav, 1 and 2Jeu. This division could benefit from being blurred. As Collins writes in the introduction to the same *Semeia* volume: 'An "apocalypse" is simply that which scholars call an apocalypse'.[16] Saying that, he later offers a definition:

> 'Apocalypse' is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[17]

Apocalypses, then, are slightly different to dialogue gospels, although many texts could be classed as both. Dialogue gospels, furthermore, are focused on the *departing* Jesus and so their disclosure of the eschatological salvation is necessary as the 'otherworldly being' (always Jesus) is no longer going to be present to guide his disciples.

The monograph-length studies of Perkins and Hartenstein have been influenced by the discussions of Rudolph, Krause and Koester, and especially their outlines of generic characteristics. For Perkins, there are common features that can be found throughout the revelatory dialogues. Common features of the narrative frame are: (1) the risen Saviour; (2) the revealer's appearance as angelic, announcing himself with an 'I am', or rebuking the disciples; (3) opponents are mentioned; (4) the disciples are to preach gnosis and possibly to face persecution; (5) the revelation has been hidden; (6) the inclusion of a post-resurrection commission; and (7) questions listed or an *erotapokriseis* style. Frequently occurring content includes: (1) the Sophia myth; (2) the necessity of gnosis; (3) asceticism; (4) the ascent of the soul; (5) New Testament interpretation; and (6) baptism. Other, less common, topics include Genesis interpretation, the nature of God, the crucifixion and cosmic eschatology.[18] The Sophia myth occurs frequently, but the revelation dialogues 'seem content to paraphrase the myth in order to provide a basis for the redemptive activity of the Gnostic revealer'.[19] This

---

[15] Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 139.
[16] Collins, 'Towards the Morphology of a Genre', 2.
[17] Collins, 'Towards the Morphology of a Genre', 9.
[18] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 68. The forms of speech used are commonly the 'Sophia myth, apocalyptic vision, hymnic or prayer language, sayings of Jesus, exegetical questions – usually about the New Testament – and doctrinal questions' (60).
[19] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 66, also 63–65.

may be why, as Perkins concludes, '[t]he predominant emphasis of the revelation dialogue is on soteriology, not on speculation about the cosmos or doctrine'.[20]

With these characteristics, her 'gnostic dialogue' genre includes thirteen works: ActPet12, ApJas, ApJohn, 1ApocJas, ApocPet$_{COP}$, BookThom, DialSav, EpPetPhil, GMary, HypArch, PistSoph and SophJesChr. The dialogues themselves draw on a variety of models – philosophical dialogues (yet the gnostic dialogue is not an exchange of ideas, but a way to 'provide the revealer with an opportunity to discharge his mission'[21]), Jewish apocalypses, Hermetic teacher/pupil dialogues and *erotapokriseis* (although gnostic dialogues have a 'polemical edge which sets them apart from the more irenic instructional dialogues').[22] Perkins sees the revelation dialogue as a 'powerful weapon' in the debate between different Christian factions. According to her, this may be inferred from GMary, with Peter representing orthodox Christians acting against Mary who represents Gnostic Christians,[23] and EpAp, 'which seems to be an orthodox attempt to use the genre against Gnostic opponents by presenting the content of post-resurrection revelation as identical with the teaching of the canonical gospels.'[24] But the 'gnostic' dialogues are written for insiders: even '[t]he paraenetic sermons must certainly have been directed at members of the community. They are not rhetorically designed to persuade the unconverted'.[25]

Within the 'gnostic dialogue' genre, Perkins notes the various interests of the texts and divides them into four categories:

(1) 'Gnostic revealer' texts: comprising ApJohn, SophJesChr, HypArch and Zost. These are texts that claim esoteric truth, and show little evidence of polemical aims.

(2) Thomasine texts, which are ascetic in character and include BookThom and DialSav.[26]

(3) Petrine texts, which are more interested in 'Christian problems' such as the passion, christology and apostolic authority (as opposed to cosmology, eschatology and

[20] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 73.
[21] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 19.
[22] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 20. The instructional dialogues are Zost, HypArch, ApJohn and SophJesChr, pp.80–98.
[23] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 133–37.
[24] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 26, n.2.
[25] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 68.
[26] These two texts Perkins regards as atypical within the genre: 'Though both make it clear that the revealer is the Risen Lord prior to the ascension, they lack the opening epiphany in response to the disciples' perplexity, which is so typical of revelation dialogues', Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 100. Parenthetical references omitted.

ascesis).[27] These claim Peter as their favoured disciple, and include ApocPet$_{COP}$, EpPetPhil and ActPet12. The Petrine texts do not rely solely on the revelation of the risen Lord, they emphasize that true instruction was given to Peter and/or the apostles before his death.[28]

(4) Non-apostolic texts, which include GMary, PistSoph, 1ApocJas and ApJas, and favour either Mary or James rather than Peter or 'the Twelve'. The James texts 'explicitly acknowledge that gnosis was not preached by the apostolic generation', and GMary and PistSoph claim that Mary or James respectively was someone 'whom Jesus loves'.[29]

Perkins' analysis of the texts, and the way that she constructs groups and finds intertextual connections is insightful. The Revealer/Thomas/Peter/non-apostolic groups highlight connections between the texts within their individual groups, but Perkins is also adept at identifying connections outside of a text's primary classification. For example, she sees how BookThom and 1ApocJas understand Jesus' familial relation to a 'twin' or 'brother' as more important than the Twelve, thus finding common ground between texts she has placed in different categories.[30]

Hartenstein offers a different approach to the genre, seeing the teachings of the 'Dialogevangelien' as divergent in content, but their narrative frames as arranged in parallel. Her scope moves away from 'gnostic dialogues' to 'dialogue gospels', which include EpAp alongside ApJohn, GMary, EpPetPhil, 1ApocJas, ApJas and SophJesChr. (SophJesChr, she argues, is the oldest dialogue and perhaps the form that the others were based on.[31]) To refer to dialogue *gospels* is to understand these texts as not only revelatory dialogues but as *gospels*, in that Jesus is the central figure; these texts claim to reproduce his words, and their message is largely salvific.[32] But for Hartenstein a criterion is that they must clearly have a post-resurrection setting.

---

[27] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 114.

[28] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 116.

[29] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 132. Perkins does not deal with the fact that James is the brother of the Lord in 1ApocJas ($_{NHC}$ 24,12–14) but appears to be one of the Twelve in ApJas (1,22–25).

[30] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 101.

[31] On SophJesChr as the earliest dialogue gospel, see Judith Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 313–14. *Contra,* van Os writes that 'Sophia cannot have been the model for the other early resurrection dialogues, as the other early works are often shorter, less coherent, and less structured', Bas van Os, 'John's Last Supper and the Resurrection Dialogues', in *John, Jesus, and History: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel,* Vol. 2, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 274.

[32] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 27–28.

Hartenstein's focus on the narrative frame draws insightful connections with the resurrection scenes of the canonical gospels, and indeed she argues that the dialogue gospels presuppose the canonical gospels – they do not intend to replace them, nor could they exist independently of them.[33] Instead, they propound a second, higher teaching ('die zweite Lehre') to the well-known, recognized and canonical one. The resurrection setting was appropriate as Jesus gained a higher status after his resurrection, although she notes that some dialogues do not propose variations between the teaching of the earthly and risen Jesus. Using EpAp allows Hartenstein to argue that the texts may be seen as gnostic through their teachings, but not on the basis of their genre.[34]

Hartenstein's concept of genre or *Gattung* is clearly and stringently defined. Her seven texts have, she claims, more in common with each other than with other texts, such as GThom, HypArch or DialSav. Such commonalities include an appearance of Jesus and the ratio of questions and answers, and depend entirely on the narrative frame.[35] Perkins noted the atypicality of BookThom and DialSav as they lack the appearance of the Saviour, and on this basis Hartenstein excludes them altogether as she sees the absence of a narrative frame to represent a different historical perspective. She writes: 'M.E. vermeidet Dial[Sav] wie EvThom eine zeitliche Einbindung der Offenbarungen – eine Situierung nach der Auferstehung ist nicht eindeutig erkennbar – und hat deshalb ein anderes Verhältnis zwischen Text und Wirklichkeit als die Dialogevangelien.'[36] If, however, we want to appreciate the *content* of the revelation, rather than the structure of the texts or their generic ancestors, then it is helpful to take a more open view of the genre. There are as many similarities and differences within Hartenstein's seven-text group as there are with related texts outside of it. The cosmologies of ApJohn and PistSoph share much in common, both having a repentant Sophia; GMary and DialSav have a similar realized/future tension; ApJas and 1ApocJas do

---

[33] But: 'Diese Bezüge lassen sich allerdings nicht durch ein Konzept von literarischer Abhängigkeit, wie es zur Bestimmung des Verhältnisses der Synoptiker entwickelt wurde, erfassen', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 20.

[34] Martina Janssen also disagrees with linking gnostic theology or christology to the dialogue genre. She uses a wide range of dialogues, including 'gnostic', 'non-gnostic', Manichaean and Hermetic, and demonstrates that there is a lack of common features (including disunity in the narrative frames) to link all dialogue texts, Martina Janssen, 'Mystagogus Gnosticus? Zur Gattung der "gnostischen Gespräche des Auferstandenen"', in *Studien zur Gnosis*, ed. Gerd Lüdemann, Studies in the Religion and History of Early Christianity (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999), 21–260.

[35] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, esp. 255–59.

[36] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 256. In a later article, Hartenstein gives up the title 'Dialogevangelien' and replaces it with the more specific 'Erscheinungsevangelien', Judith Hartenstein, 'Erscheinungsevangelien (Gespräche mit dem Auferstandenen) im Kontext frühchristlicher Theologie: Anknüpfungspunkte und Besonderheiten der christologischen Vorstellungen', in *The Apocryphal Gospels within the Context of Early Christian Theology*, ed. Jens Schröter (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 305–32.

not have a high regard for the Twelve – but neither does GJudas; and EpAp and AscIsa share an angelomorphic christology. By pigeonholing texts within too rigid a genre classification, we might miss out on a lot.

Much like Perkins, Hartenstein sees the dialogue gospels as addressed to their own 'Trägergruppe', and on the whole they are neither suitable nor intended for missionary purposes.[37] These groups had a clear self-conscious understanding of themselves, believing themselves to be the recipients of an in-depth understanding of Jesus' teachings: 'die zweite Lehre'. However, she argues that the group(s) behind the dialogue gospels saw themselves as part of mainstream Christianity, and (with the exception of ApJas) they were not esoteric writings.

Petersen builds on Hartenstein's work, identifying a group of texts that have an appearance of the resurrected Jesus as a focal point.[38] She names SophJesChr, 1ApocJas, GMary, EpAp and PistSoph as 'Erscheinungsevangelien' (her main focus is on women in these texts).[39] Petersen hypothesizes that the use of dialogue within the text serves the purpose of inciting dialogue among readers and hearers, writing:

> Dialoge wurden (ebenso wie andere antike Texte) vorwiegend nicht privat rezipiert, sondern vorgelesen, gehört und wohl auch diskutiert, wobei die dialogische Situation verdoppelt wurde.[40]

Therefore, the dialogue within the text is important for the transmission of the text's contents within the community of its readers. The fact that these texts were *designed* to be read aloud showed that the intention was to expand the audience for Jesus' revelatory speech. Furthermore, Petersen posits that appearance dialogues summarize their revelation at the end, and this revelation is intended to be repeated and learned by its readers.[41] Thus, she links the salvific message contained within the text with the form of the text itself.

---

[37] 'Aus der Analyse der Schriften ergibt sich aber als Gemeinsamkeit, daß alle in erster Linie der Erbauung, Stützung und Festigung ihrer Trägergruppe beabsichtigen', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 251.
[38] Petersen maintains Hartenstein's view on Christianity and 'gnosticism', writing: 'Die Texte dokumentieren eine Vermischung und Durchdringung von Christlichem und Gnostischem, und klare Unterscheidungen zwischen beidem sind in vielen Fällen kaum zu treffen', Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 42.
[39] Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 38. In all of her selected texts but 1ApJas, Jesus appears to female disciples whether first (as in EpAp, GMary) or within the group (SophJesChr, PistSoph). Although 1ApJas does not have an appearance to a female disciple, the text identifies a group of women as honoured disciples.
[40] Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 43.
[41] Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 43.

Perkins and Hartenstein have both been influenced by older, now outdated, definitions of gnosticism. Perkins' view of revelatory dialogues ('gnostic dialogues') may be summed up by her statement that '[t]he revelation dialogue seems to have been as characteristic of Christian Gnostics as the Gospel was of orthodox Christians'.[42] Similarly, Hartenstein constructs her analysis through this gnostic/Christian dichotomy, but without linking genre and christology. Put bluntly, she sees the narrative frame, which is the focus of her study, as a Christian frame imposed on a gnostic dialogue, and only because she focuses on the Christian narrative frame can she make connections to the canonical gospels: 'Zugleich ist die Rahmenerzählung für einige Schriften der einzige Teil, im dem Beziehungen zu anderer christlicher Überlieferung deutlich werden, speziell zu den Erscheinungsgeschichten in den Schlußkapiteln der kanonischen Evangelien'.[43] This separation of a Christian narrative frame and the 'gnostic' revelation undermines the integrity of the text as a whole, as well as failing to recognize the diversity of the wider Christian landscape.[44] It also influences the way she reads the individual texts; all of these texts, she argues, have a relationship to 'gnostische Aussagen', whether it be simple such as SophJesChr, ApJohn and EpPetPhil, more developed as in GMary and 1ApocJas, presupposed as in ApJas, or polemical as in EpAp.[45] Since Perkins' and Hartenstein's monographs, however, the way that the majority of scholars construct the relationship between early Christianities, and especially 'gnostic' texts, has changed. For example, Jenott's monograph on GJudas sees the old gnostic/New Testament dichotomy as questionable: 'Given the wide variety of perspectives both within the New Testament itself and among so-called Gnostic texts, I genuinely have no idea what constitutes a Gnostic point of view or a New Testament lens'.[46] This new sense of the fluidity of traditional boundaries needs to be taken into account when constructing our genre, and also when reading the individual texts.

---

[42] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 26. For criticism of this, see Janssen, 'Mystagogus Gnosticus?'. Also, King's extensive footnote: Karen L. King, *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2003), 192–93, n.8.

[43] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 3.

[44] Despite the overall rhetoric of the Christian narrative frame and the 'gnostic' teaching being largely incompatible, Hartenstein does attempt to appreciate each text on its own basis without instantly ascribing to it a gnostic worldview. Thus she notes that '[b]ei den von mir untersuchten Schriften ist allerdings nicht immer eindeutig, ob es sich um gnostische Schriften handelt, da der Weltentstehungsmythos nicht in allen vorkommt', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 31.

[45] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 254.

[46] Lance Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas: Coptic Text, Translation, and Historical Interpretation of 'the Betrayer's Gospel'*, STAC 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 2.

In the scholarship that has investigated this group of texts (in varying forms), there has been no consensus regarding the name or form of the genre, or which texts should be considered to belong within it. Rudolph, Koester, Perkins and Hartenstein, among others, are interested in different things and so choose to discuss different texts. Hartenstein is interested in the narrative frame and so excludes DialSav and BookThom from her work, and Perkins is interested in gnosticism and so excludes EpAp. When these scholars define a genre, they are not coming up with the same title or collection because they are not starting with the same set of questions. The table below shows the differences in the titles and texts of these comparable literary genres.

Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 3rd ed. (1959)[54]	Rudolph (1968)[55]	Perkins (1980)[56]	Schneemelcher, 6th ed. (1990)[57]	Hartenstein (2000)[58]	Tuckett (2005)[59]	Markschies-Schröter (2012)[60]	Bockmuehl (2017)[61]
'*Wechselsgespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach seiner Auferstehung*' EpAp Freer-Logion Gospel-fragment of Strassburg Coptic papyrus '*Andere gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Literatur*'[62] ApJas ApJohn BookThom DialSav Jeu GJudas GMary PistSoph SophJesChr	'*Der gnostische "Dialog"*' 1ApocJas ApJohn ApocPaul 2Jeu GMary PistSoph SophJesChr The *Kephalaia*	'*Gnostic Dialogues*' ActPet12 ApJas ApJohn 1ApocJas ApocPet$_{COP}$ BookThom DialSav EpPetPhil GMary HypArch PistSoph SophJesChr	'*Dialoge des Erlösers*' ApJas 1ApocJas 2ApocJas BookThom DialSav EpAp EpPetPhil Freer-Logion '*Andere gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Literatur*' ApJas ApJohn BookThom DialSav· Jeu GJudas GMary PistSoph SophJesChr	'*Dialogevangelien*' ApJas 1ApocJas ApJohn EpAp EpPetPhil GMary SophJesChr	'*Resurrection discourses/ dialogues*' ApJas ApJohn (BookThom) (DialSav) EpAp GMary (GThom) SophJesChr	'*Dialogische Evangelien*' (Allogenes) ApJas 1ApocJas 2ApocJas BookThom DialSav EpAp EpPetPhil Freer-Logion Fragment of dialogue between John and Jesus* GJudas GMary SophJesChr	'*Post-resurrection discourse gospels*' ApJas 1ApocJas 2ApocJas EpAp EpPetPhil GMary GPhil GThom SophJesChr

[54] Hennecke and Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Evangelien*.

[55] Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus'.

[56] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*.

[57] W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*.

[58] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*.

[59] Christopher Tuckett, 'Forty Other Gospels', in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 238–53.

[60] Christoph Markschies and Jens Schröter, eds., *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Evangelien und Verwandtes*, vol.1 pt. 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

[61] Markus Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, Interpretation (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017).

[62] This is split into several sections and includes many more texts. I only include here those that are relevant to us. This is also the case with the *NT Apocrypha* 1990 edition in the fourth column above. (GJudas there refers to the Gospel of Judas as mentioned by Irenaeus, as Codex Tcachos was only made available in 2006.)

In the nature of making a 'collection' of NT Apocrypha, editors have little choice but to create generic categories, and so in the 1959 and 1990 Hennecke-Schneemelcher editions, 'dialogues' were differentiated from 'gospels'. The difficulties in placing texts into a single category are apparent in the 1990 edition, in which three texts (ApJas, DialSav and BookThom) appear in both 'dialogues with the Saviour' and 'gnostic gospels and related literature'. Markschies-Schröter's 2012 collection combines the two categories into one ('Dialogevangelien') and creates a more substantive list.

The same texts are repeated in multiple columns, but the lists are not as uniform as we might expect. GMary and SophJesChr are the only texts that appear in each column. Hartenstein omitted DialSav and BookThom because they lack the narrative frame and GJudas because it does not have a post-resurrection setting. Perkins included HypArch and Zost because her focus is on gnosticism. It is unclear why Markschies-Schröter and Bockmuehl left out ApJohn.[63] The genre titles and lists make it quite apparent that they reflect the interests of the modern authors rather than how the early Christians viewed the texts in question. As modern scholars attempt to define and delimit a genre, they are putting themselves in juxtaposition with their contemporaries who are interested in the same texts but place them in different generic categories and alongside different ancient writings on the basis of their own differing interests.

Recently, Tuckett and Bockmuehl have created new taxonomies that are less interested in strict genre definitions than the works discussed previously. Tuckett writes about 'resurrection dialogues', which include GMary, ApJas, SophJesChr, ApJohn, DialSav, BookThom, EpAp and GThom.[64] He notes that DialSav and BookThom are not explicit about a post-resurrection setting, but suggests that this might be implied, especially in view of the fragmentary nature of DialSav.[65] GThom is less clear, but Tuckett wonders whether the present tense of λέγει in the Greek fragments (as opposed to the ambiguous tense πεχε in the Coptic) suggests a speaker in the present, i.e. the risen Jesus.[66]

Further, dialogue elements are also present: on occasion followers of Jesus, individually or collectively, pose questions to which Jesus responds (sayings 6, 12,

---

[63] Neither appear to offer an explanation for this.
[64] Tuckett, 'Forty Other Gospels'.
[65] Tuckett, 'Forty Other Gospels', 247.
[66] But note that Logion 1 on POxy.654 has εἶπεν.

13, 20, 21 etc.). It may be, then, that the *Gospel of Thomas* is rather more like a 'resurrection dialogue' than might appear at first sight, and that in generic terms, not too large a wedge should be driven between *Thomas* (as an alleged 'sayings gospel') and other resurrection dialogues.[67]

Bockmuehl creates a category named 'post-resurrection discourse gospels', a category in which 'many of the lines of textual, ideological, and genre identification are patently blurred'.[68] In it he includes those texts that are 'unambiguous examples of a post-resurrection setting', including EpAp, SophJesChr, ApJas, 1ApocJas and EpPetPhil, as well as those that 'strongly presuppose or imply such a narrative setting', such as GMary and 2ApocJas.[69] He also wants to impose 'extremely fluid' boundaries, expanding the genre to include GThom and GPhil, the latter described as 'a timeless mode of instruction that may only be tenuously identified as the teaching of Jesus'.[70] On GThom, Bockmuehl sees Christ's title title ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲛⲏ̅ // ἰῆς ὁ ζῶν (POxy 654) in the prologue as a 'reference to the heavenly, eternal as opposed to the earthly Christ'.[71] On the matter of 'timelessness', Bockmuehl points to the Johannine Jesus:

> One may also usefully compare and contrast the apparent timelessness of John's loquaciously self-referential, supratemporal, descended, and perhaps already ascended Son who seems – particularly in the Farewell Discourses of chapters 14–17 – to speak almost from a viewpoint outside history.[72]

Bringing John FD into the equation is useful. In these chapters, Jesus answers the questions of individuals (13.36–14.14) and a larger group (16.17) about his departure and the role of

---

[67] Tuckett, 'Forty Other Gospels', 248. *Contra,* Klauck insists that nothing in GThom points to a resurrection dialogue, Klauck, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, 146.
[68] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 161.
[69] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 162. Yet the Freer Logion 'cannot be regarded as a dialogue gospel' as it never existed independently of Mark (162–63). Presumably then, neither can John FD. Bockmuehl argues for the fluid boundaries of his genre, but unfortunately never expains what the boundary limits might be.
[70] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 163. GPhil is not a dialogue, nor a narrative, but a theological reflection on Christ, and it is unclear why it would be placed alongside dialogue gospels. Bockmuehl writes that: 'In substance and genre, however *Philip* seems remote from most of the other texts discussed in this [book]' (183–84). He appears to include it because it stands alongside GThom in NHC2: '[I]t must be significant that two such noncanonical gospels are here bound together in the same volume, and indeed that the text of *Philip* begins without any intervening new title' (184). But Coptic titles come at the end of texts (sometimes at the beginning too), and GThom does conclude with a title that separates the two gospels.
[71] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 164.
[72] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 174–75.

the disciples in his absence. Dettwiler and van Os have noted the similarities between this text and dialogue gospels,[73] but it is generally considered without reference to them. With an 'open' view of genre, in which generic categories are fluid rather than fixed entities, they can be brought into much closer contact.

This overview serves to demonstrate that, despite the meticulous pigeonholing of Hartenstein and others discussed, texts do not fit into neat genre boxes.[74] The term 'dialogue gospel' in itself may point to flexibility as these texts are both gospel and dialogue. But, as we shall see, they can also be revelations, acts and epistles. They might include visions, farewell discourses or *erotapokriseis*. The title 'apocalypse', 'epistle' or 'evangelion' might appear on the manuscript, or no title at all.

1.2. The Genre Question

1.2.1. *Genre for Interpretation and Comparison*

It has been shown that a definition or agreement on the dialogue gospel genre does not exist, and it has been suggested that it is unhelpful to be prescriptive about the texts included in a genre. The question now is how and to what purpose we go about making a category of texts. Study of ancient Christian literature should be informed by the way that literary theorists now conceive of genre, which has changed dramatically in the recent past. Genre is increasingly regarded as fluid and dynamic rather than static, rigid and constraining. Derrida's paradoxical statement has become widely cited: 'Every text participates in one or several genres, there is no genreless text; there is always a genre and genres, yet such participation never amounts to belonging.'[75] Derrida articulates the difficulty and necessity of genre. A text can participate in more than one genre, and does not have to be hermeneutically confined by its primary genre. The genres themselves are socially-invented rhetorical categories; they do not exist independently of the scholars who create them.[76] I do not want to get entangled in the

---

[73] Dettwiler, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten*, 21–26; van Os, 'John's Last Supper and the Resurrection Dialogues'.

[74] The term 'genre' here needs some qualification. Collins writes: 'By "literary genre" we mean a group of written texts marked by distinctive recurring characteristics which constitute a recognizable and coherent type of writing', Collins, 'Towards the Morphology of a Genre', 1. However, some or many of these 'recurring characteristics' may not be 'distinctive' at all but shared with texts in a quite different generic category. In other words, genres are 'open' to one another and overlap; conversely, a single text may inhabit multiple genres.

[75] Jacques Derrida, 'The Law of Genre', *Glyph* 7 (1980): 212.

[76] Tzvetan Todorov, 'The Origin of Genres', in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff (New York: Longman, 2000), 193–209.

'theoretical minefield' of genre theory, as Chandler describes it.[77] Instead, we will see the study of genre in early Christian literature as a microcosm of the larger field of literary studies.[78]

Some scholars of early Christian literature argue that the genre of a text drastically affects the way we interpret it. For example, Burridge writes that genre is vital as 'the set of conventions and expectations mediating between authors and audiences, guiding both the production and the interpretation of texts',[79] and Stanton warns his readers that 'gospels are not letters' and therefore should not be read as such.[80] He writes:

> The very first step in the interpretation of any writing, whether ancient or modern, is to establish its literary genre. If we make a mistake about the literary genre of the gospels, interpretation will be skewed or even misguided. A decision about the genre of a work and the discovery of its meaning are inextricably inter-related; different types of text require different types of interpretation.[81]

This 'genre as interpretation' argument goes hand in hand with a view of genre as static, formal and inflexible. Burridge's idea of genre is that the canonical gospels are ancient *bioi*. This is productive only for certain texts. It misses the fact that not all gospels are biographies (cf. GThom), and that *bioi* gospels can include sections from other genres (cf. the Johannine farewell discouse). Thus, interpreting *all* gospels through the *bios* lens will just not work.[82] As we have already seen, there are multiple ways in which early Christian texts featuring dialogues can be assigned to a genre.

---

[77] Daniel Chandler, 'An Introduction to Genre Theory', 2000 [1997], 2. Available from http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.pdf
[78] The change in the way genre is perceived is reflected also in classics, e.g. John Marincola, 'Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, ed. C. S. Kraus, Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava: Supplementum 191 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 281–324.
[79] Richard A. Burridge, 'Who Writes, Why, and for Whom?', in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 112.
[80] Graham N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 193. Perkins also: 'Our perception of the genre of any writing is an important help in interpreting it. The implication of particular details may change radically if we change our view of a writing's genre', Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 26–27.
[81] Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel*, 192.
[82] To interpret a text a reader does not need to identify its literary genre – the act of interpretation is not affected by this identification. Reading a text as a work of fiction or a work of history might produce different results but that necessitates that there are right and wrong answers in interpretation. Identifying a text as one genre or another will simply produce different results.

Rather than seeing genre as a method for interpretation, it is more helpful to see it as a heuristic tool for comparison. Creating a genre identifies texts that have certain similarities and therefore can comfortably be placed in a comparative framework. By viewing the texts within a genre, analysis is not limited to a single text, but instead allows various and, at points, disparate texts to be brought together. For example, although EpAp and ApJohn diverge widely in their christology, they both present Jesus in dialogue with his disciples after his resurrection. Placing them together in a comparative framework allows new light to be shed on the individual texts – ApJohn's polymorphic appearance of the risen Christ, as a child, old man and servant, highlights EpAp's depiction of Jesus' resurrected body as no different to his crucified body demonstrating its much stricter emphasis on fleshliness than the ambiguous portrayals of the risen Christ in the canonical gospels. Defining a genre for this purpose allows the analysis to draw out both similarities and differences between the texts, but also holds the potential for gaining new insights into unique qualities of the individual texts. Since genres overlap, equally effective comparisons may also be made across their now-fluid boundaries.

1.2.2. *Assigning Genres*

For a large proportion of early Christian literature, and particularly that deemed 'apocryphal', the way we assign genre to it is often both arbitrary and rigid. But, in light of developments in literary theory, opposition towards pigeonholing texts is increasing. Recently, Smith and Kostopoulos have applied an open view of genre to NT writings, arguing that 'ancient texts do not bear the imprints of a rigid system of generic classification', and that the 'restrictive system of generic categorisation' needs to be challenged.[83] Luke/Acts is a particularly striking example, and the subject of Smith and Kostopoulos' study. Acts has been labelled an apology, an epic, a biography, a history and a novel/romance.[84] Some scholars have tried to place Luke and Acts in the same genre but, as Smith and Kostopoulos write, 'their efforts to force the two volumes into one generic classification often result in awkward pairing – one

---

[83] See Daniel Lynwood Smith and Zachary Lundin Kostopoulos, 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts', *NTS* 63, no. 3 (2017): 405.

[84] See Sean A. Adams, *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography*, SNTSMS 156 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 5–22.

volume fits well enough, but the other resembles a round peg wedged into a square hole'.[85] Smith and Kostopoulos argue:

> We are not seeking to cast Luke-Acts as the 'texte sans genre', but as a text that indeed participates in (and whose author emulates) multiple literary traditions of the ancient Mediterranean world. The emphasis on 'participation' frees us from the problem of choosing a rigid generic category for Luke-Acts.[86]

Acts is not an apology *or* an epic *or* a biography, but all of the above. In fact, claiming a single genre and reading it solely through that lens might lead to 'misguided' interpretation, in the words of Stanton, whereas reading it through the lens of multiple genres may well lead to a more adequate interpretation.

Genre does not have to apply to a whole text either. A single text can include sections relating to different genres. John, for example, is a gospel comprised of narratives, dialogues and monologues, as Dodd put it.[87] Attridge sees these sections within John as purposefully bending a traditional view of genre: For example, 'John 3 is a paradigmatic revealer discourse, yet no sooner does it make a dramatic revelation than it points to ambiguities and tensions within the terms of that revelation. A revelatory genre is bent'.[88] The way in which these pockets of different genres fit within the larger 'gospel' genre is 'playful'[89] and Attridge suggests that 'in the imagination of the fourth evangelist, genres are bent because words themselves are bent'.[90] Genre, then, is not a fixed entity.

Coming back to the dialogue gospels – the name 'dialogue gospel' already suggests that these texts can be both dialogues *and* gospels. But they can also be letters. And letters

---

[85] Smith and Kostopoulos, 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts', 391.
[86] Smith and Kostopoulos, 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts', 406–7.
[87] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), esp. 133–34.
[88] Harold W. Attridge, 'Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 121, no. 1 (2002): 12–13.
[89] Attridge, 'Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel', 19.
[90] Attridge, 'Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel', 21: 'If something quite spectacular happens to flesh when the Word hits it, something equally wondrous happens to ordinary words when they try to convey the Word itself. Revealing words reveal riddles; realistic similitudes become surreal; words of testimony undercut the validity of any ordinary act of testifying; words of farewell become words of powerful presence; words of prayer negate the distance between worshiper and God; words that signify shame, death on a cross, become words that enshrine value, allure disciples, give a command, and glorify God.'

can be basically anything.[91] The Book of Revelation and EpAp are both letters, but could belong to several genres as their comparable openings suggest:

Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, καὶ ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅσα εἶδεν. Μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς. Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ … (Rev 1.1–4)

The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show his servants what must soon take place; he made it known by sending his angel to his servant John, who testified to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ, even to all that he saw. Blessed is the one who reads aloud the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear and who keep what is written in it; for the time is near. John to the seven churches that are in Asia …

The book of what Jesus Christ revealed to his disciples … John and Thomas and Peter and Andrew and James and Philip and Bartholomew and Matthew and Nathanael and Judas the Zealot and Cephas we have written to the churches of the east and the west, the north and the south. In proclaiming and declaring to you our Lord Jesus Christ, we write about how we both heard him and touched him after he was raised from the dead, and how he revealed to us what is great and wonderful and true. (EpAp 1.1–2.3)[92]

(Start of the Coptic manuscript:) ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲡⲓⲛϫⲛⲟ ⲉⲁⲛⲥϩⲉⲓ̈ ⲛⲏⲧⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧ[ⲙ]ⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣ[ⲓⲁ] ⲛ̄ⲡⲓⲛⲥⲱⲣ ⲡⲭⲥ ⲛⲉⲧⲁϥⲉⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲛⲥⲁⲛⲧ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲁ[ⲟⲩ ⲉ]ⲧⲓ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲙⲉⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ (EpAp 7.1)

For this reason we have not hesitated to write to you about the [t]estimo[ny] of our Saviour Christ, the things he did as we watched him, a[nd t]hat are still in (our) thoughts and works.

The opening of Revelation shows that it could be judged to be a revelation or apocalypse (1.1–2), a prophecy (1.3) or a letter (1.4f.), or all of the above.[93] The opening of EpAp suggests a book, a gospel and a letter. There is no epistolary ending and the majority of the text has no trace of the letter-form of its opening. This is comparable to other dialogue gospels: ApJas begins with an epistolary greeting, with the recipient asking James for a 'secret book' (ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲣⲩⲫⲟⲛ [1,10]), but the bulk of the text is dialogue and apocalypse, with an epistolary conclusion.[94] EpPetPhil too begins as a letter but then changes to a narrative reminiscent of Acts literature.[95] Early Christians used the letter form openly, which meant that a letter could be a gospel too,[96] and EpAp, ApJas and EpPetPhil are all examples of this.[97]

Many scholars who work on "non-canonical gospel-like texts" endorse an inclusive definition of gospel, seeing a 'gospel' as a text that purports to give information about the life and/or teaching of Jesus.[98] The table above shows that some scholars have been using this title with reference to ApJohn and DialSav, among many other texts. Of our dialogue gospels, only GMary and GJudas are self-titled 'gospel' in the extant manuscripts. The Coptic BG and Greek PRyl manuscripts of GMary contain the subscript 'gospel', which has left scholars perplexed regarding its genre. The missing beginning causes further ambiguity. Bass asks 'Is it a Gnostic revelation dialogue, apocalypse, gospel or post-resurrection dialogue?'[99] Following Perkins' characteristics of 'gnostic revelation dialogue', King and Tuckett write

---

[93] See Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1–17. Bauckham argues that Revelation belongs in three categories: apocalypse, prophecy and letter.

[94] The term 'book' (ⲭⲱⲱⲙⲉ) is used in reference to books the apostles were writing (2,14–16). Scopello calls its genre 'heterogeneous' and Williams suggests that the letter may be a frame added later to the original content, Marvin Meyer and Madeleine Scopello, 'The Secret Book of James', in *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures: The International Edition*, ed. Marvin Meyer (New York: Harper Collins, 2007), 20; Francis E. Williams, 'The Apocryphon of James - 1,2: 1.1 - 16:30', in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, NHMS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 17–18. But it is incorrect to assume that anything that looks anomalous from the perspective of genre must be a later addition.

[95] F. Lapham, *Peter: The Myth, the Man and the Writings: A Study of the Early Petrine Text and Tradition* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 172.

[96] Timo Glaser, 'Liaisons Dangereuses: Epistolary Novels in Antiquity', in *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, ed. Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Chicester and Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 252–53; Andrew Gregory, 'Non-Canonical Epistles and Related Literature', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Christopher Tuckett and Andrew Gregory (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 90–114; Richard Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Apostolic Letters', *JBL* 107, no. 3 (1988): esp. 474.

[97] Bauckham refers to ApJas and EpAp as '[l]etters with mainly Gospel content', Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Apostolic Letters', 483.

[98] In the wider field, scholars vary in their willingness to apply the term 'gospel' to non-canonical gospels. For the division in scholarship, see Judith A. Diehl, 'What Is a "Gospel"? Recent Studies in the Gospel Genre', *Currents in Biblical Research* 9, no. 2 (2011): 171–99.

[99] Ardyth L. Bass, *Composition and Redaction in the Coptic Gospel of Mary* (Milwaukee, WI: PhD Thesis, Marquette University, 2007), 2.

that it fits the characteristics of a post-resurrection revelation dialogue.[100] Tuckett thinks it best not to 'specify the genre of a text like the *Gospel of Mary* too narrowly', as it may foreclose or predetermine interpretative possibilities,[101] and while GMary has its closest parallels with revelation discourses/dialogues/dialogue gospels,[102] it can be called a gospel 'if one is willing to accept the text's own self-description as a "gospel"'.[103] King, on the other hand, prefers 'post-resurrection dialogue' to 'gospel', as the latter indicates 'the message and promise of the Savior, not the genre of the work'.[104] King sees post-resurrection dialogues as mutually exclusive to gospel, whereas Tuckett does not. Luttikhuizen does not agree that GMary is a revelation dialogue at all: 'At first sight, one is tempted to put the first part of the Gospel of Mary on a level with other revelation dialogues… But upon closer examination, this equation seems to be quite problematic'.[105] He argues that *only* Jesus' communication with Mary, rather than his dialogue with Peter and others, can be paralleled to revelation dialogues. This seems counter-intuitive as the dialogue with Mary is a vision whereas the dialogue with Peter (from the little we have of it) appears to be much closer to other dialogue gospels; but Luttikhuizen proposes that Peter's dialogue with the Saviour leaves the disciples in a state of fear, unable to preach and with unanswered questions, which is not comparable to revelation dialogues.[106] Fallon raises another possibility, that GMary is an apocalypse presented through a dialogue, due to its soteriological concerns and personal eschatology.[107] Denzey Lewis follows this, writing: '*GosMary* is an apocalypse, in which a seer (in this case, Mary) is given a tour of the cosmos by a privileged being (in this case, Jesus as the Savior). This text is *also* a revelation dialogue'.[108] The confusion that GMary causes about where it belongs demonstrates that texts cannot be pigeonholed. GMary is a gospel, a dialogue, a dialogue gospel and an apocalypse.

Assigning a text to a genre does not render clear criteria or conclusions. If genre does act as an interpretative tool, as Burridge and Stanton among many others have suggested,

---

[100] Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Gospel of Mary* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 37–38; King, *Mary*, 30.
[101] Tuckett, *Mary*, 31.
[102] Tuckett, *Mary*, 41.
[103] Tuckett, *Mary*, 38.
[104] King, *Mary*, 30.
[105] Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, 'The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues', *NovT* 30, no. 2 (1988): 163.
[106] Luttikhuizen, 'The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues', 163–64.
[107] Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 131.
[108] Italics inserted. Nicola Denzey Lewis, *Introduction to 'Gnosticism': Ancient Voices, Christian Worlds* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 269.

then we need to reassess our understanding of genre, making it more elastic and expansive and recognizing the role of the scholar in assigning a genre to a text. The creation, delimitation and use of a 'dialogue gospel' genre brings out the distinctive features of the resulting group of texts, but it needs to remain open to intertextual links across the entire field of early Christian literature, and beyond.

1.3. The Dialogue Gospels

On the definition adopted here, to be a 'dialogue gospel' a text must contain two things: (1) Jesus as the central character, and (2) dialogue with one or more disciples. This already rules out HypArch, Zost and Allogenes, none of which have a revealer that is recognizably Jesus. 2ApocJas and GPhil are also excluded due to their lack of dialogue.

For our purposes, 13 main texts have been selected that fit these criteria.[109] John FD is probably the earliest and PistSoph is almost certainly the latest, but it is not possible to date the rest chronologically; most scholars agree that the others can be dated to the late second/early third century, but the texts could easily be earlier or later.[110] Instead of arranging the texts in a hypothetical chronological order, they have been arranged in the discussion that follows by the disciple(s) that Jesus is conversing with. The text is attributed to John in the case of ApJohn and John FD, Peter is the favoured disciple in EpPetPhil and ApocPet, James in 1ApocJas and ApJas; in PistSoph it is possible to see James and Mary as the blessed disciples, and Mary alone in GMary. Another text that privileges one disciple exclusively is BookThom, in which Jesus speaks to Thomas his twin. GJudas is primarily a dialogue

---

[109] Those on the periphery include: (1) ApocPet COP (NHC 7,3), in which Christ and Peter discuss christology and Jesus' death in the Temple. The reason that it is placed on the periphery of dialogue gospels is that Peter only questions the Lord once. (2) The *Book of Jeu* (Bruce Codex), which opens as a dialogue between the apostles, speaking with one voice, and Jesus. But the majority of the text is an explanation of different treasuries (heavenly levels), with a picture on each page, and a gnostic hymn. (3) The Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon, once known as the 'Gospel of the Saviour' (P.Berl.22220), which is an extremely fragmentary dialogue between the Saviour and his collective disciples before the passion. Sucui argues that it should be classified as a 'pseudo-apostolic memoir' written no earlier than the fifth century, Alin Suciu, *The Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon: A Coptic Apostolic Memoir*, WUNT 370 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017). Although the Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon shares features with the dialogue gospels, Suciu's reclassification of the text (as well as its fragmentary nature) preclude it from our discussion. (4) 'Fragments of a dialogue between John and Jesus' is too fragmentary to classify as a dialogue gospel. (5) GThom (NHC 2,1; POxy 1; POxy 654; POxy 655) is a collection of Jesus' sayings and question-and-answers. However, only two of the logia (60, 61) contain more dialogue than a single question and answer.

[110] As many of these texts are only extant in Coptic but presumed to be translated from Greek, the dating is difficult. The editors of the collections of dialogue gospels are not very interested in the question of date, usually placing them somewhere between mid/late second century and early third century (with the exceptions of John FD and PistSoph).

between Judas and Jesus, but Judas may not be exactly privileged. In DialSav, we see Matthew, Judas and Mary in dialogue with Christ, the Eleven in EpAp and the twelve apostles and seven women in SophJesChr.

The following outlines are intended as a preliminary survey of these texts. In some cases, connections to other dialogue gospels will be drawn out.

(i) Apocryphon of John ($_{NHC}$ 2,1; $_{NHC}$ 3,1; $_{NHC}$ 4,1; $_{BG}$ 2)[111] is a revelation from the risen Saviour to John, son of Zebedee, primarily concerning cosmic and human history. The text is preserved in four versions – two short (NHC 3; BG) and two long (NHC 2; NHC 4).[112] In its longer form, it is the lengthiest of the dialogue gospels and considered 'one of the most coherent and comprehensive narrations of the revelatory account traditionally labelled as "Gnostic"'.[113]

The text begins with an introductory scene, set in the Temple, with a Pharisee telling John that the 'Nazorene' has deceived him and turned him away from the traditions of his fathers. An upset John leaves the Temple and goes to a mountain, where the risen Jesus appears to him in the three-fold form of a child, old person and servant. The subsequent revelation includes a lengthy description of the transcendent deity as the source of everything; his emanation of a chain of aeons (or light beings) including Sophia and Christ;[114] the birth of Yaldabaoth, begotten from Sophia without a consort, resulting in a monstrous form and jealous nature; and an alternative version of Gen 1–9, retelling the early history of humankind. When Yaldabaoth is born, Sophia is ashamed and hides him from the other aeons, and consequently he is unaware of their existence. A famous line from the text is Yaldabaoth's boast: 'I am a jealous god and there is no other god beside me' (ⲁⲛⲟⲕ` ⲁⲛⲕ` ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥ`ⲕⲱϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲕⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲗ̄ⲗⲁⲓ̈ [$_{NHC2}$ 13,8–9]), to which the narrator

---

[111] The three versions in the Nag Hammadi Codices each appears at the beginning of their respective codex, potentially demonstrating the text's importance, see Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking 'Gnosticism': An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 235–62, 306–10. The version in BG follows GMary.

[112] The two copies of the longer version are virtually identical, whereas the two copies of the shorter version have substantive variants. The longer versions include a lengthy citation from the *Book of Zoroaster* and a concluding monologue from 'Pronoia: Forethought'.

[113] Zlatko Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John*, NHMS 52 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 1.

[114] A useful chart showing the levels of existence in the cosmological narrative can be found in Karen L. King, *The Secret Revelation of John* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2006), 87. King's entire description, with analysis, of the narrative of ApJohn is helpful. She splits the text into four parts: the ideal (the divine realm); the problem (rupture); the result (the situation of humanity in the world); and the solution (salvation), see 85–156.

responds, 'If there were no other god over him, of whom would he be jealous?' (ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲛ̄ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ϣⲟⲟⲡ` ⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲕⲱϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ [ₙₕ𝒸₂ 13,12–13]). It is also this boast that initiates Sophia's repentance (she realizes that this ignorant and wicked claim is the result of her own actions), to which the highest Father responds and entreats the other divinities to help both her and humanity.

In ApJohn's version of the creation story, Yaldabaoth inherits some of Sophia's power and sets about creating the cosmos. He creates malevolent and ignorant rulers who introduce injustice into the world, and it is under their rule that humanity dwells. As a result of the boast, the image of the Autogenes-Christ (a light being) is projected onto the waters of the lower world, inspiring Yaldabaoth and his minions to make Adam in the image and likeness. Despite being made in the image of the divine, Adam is not spiritual: 'in contrast to the Genesis narrative, only "image" refers to the divine (the image of the First Human), while "likeness" refers to the flawed mimicry of the lower gods (Yaldabaoth and his authorities)'.[115] Adam only becomes a divine being when he receives the spirit of Sophia, and this spirit makes him superior to the lower realm. The archons are jealous and imprison him in matter, then specifically in a body, and then in a trance to cause him to forget the divine spirit that resides within him. A series of misdemeanours follows. They create Eve and expel her and Adam from Paradise. The Protarchon rapes Eve (creating Cain and Abel) and then the other archons later have sex with human women by masquerading as their husbands. The powers also entrap humanity in fate and attempt to wipe out civilization in a great flood.

But because of Sophia's repentance, every time the archons attempt to entrap humanity, the light-being Epinoia foils them. Epinoia dwells with Adam, and then as an eagle on the tree of the 'knowledge of good and evil', and instructs Adam and Eve. As King writes: 'Each move the creator makes prompts a countermove from the Divine Realm to rescue humanity, which in its turn provokes a response by the world rulers'.[116] As Epinoia is there to tell Adam the truth, Adam perceives his true nature and begets Seth, who possesses the image of the true God. (Cain and Abel are children of Yaldabaoth and the lesser Eve.) Some of humanity are Seth's progeny, and they also belong to the immovable generation, but others will be led astray by the counterfeit spirit that closes their hearts. John is to give the teachings, in secret, to his fellow spirits in the immovable generation.

---

[115] King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, 100.
[116] King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, 96. King sees ApJohn as a series of 'Moves and Countermoves' (97).

This text may be viewed as a dialogue gospel, although it is so only superficially. In the opening the exalted Christ appears and announces that he will respond to John's anxious questions about soteriology (ᴮᴳ 20,4–22,16); here as elsewhere, soteriological issues are discussed by way of protology. John asks him to proceed (ᴮᴳ 22,16–17), and intervenes only three times in the long protological discourse that follows (ᴮᴳ 45,6–7; 58,1–3, 14–15). However, the following section, the treatment of eschatological issues, does take dialogue format (ᴮᴳ 64,14–71,5), and the frame narrative has close affinities with other dialogue gospels such as Jesus' departure at the end.

As ApJohn has been viewed as a 'master-narrative' of 'the Sethian myth', 'the Sophia myth', or 'the Gnostic myth' (also seen in Irenaeus' *Adv. Haer.* 1.29–30),[117] it is often used as a basis for understanding texts that allude to the same material, such as SophJesChr and EpPetPhil.

(ii) Johannine Farewell Discourse (John 13.31–17.1) is at the same time a revelation dialogue, a farewell discourse, and part of a *bios* gospel.[118] In 13.31, following Judas' exit, Jesus begins to speak about his own imminent departure, and a select group of disciples (Peter, Thomas, Philip and Judas 'not Iscariot') ask him about his destination and the possibility of following him there (13.36–37), the way he will take (14.5), the revelation of the Father (14.9), and his secret manifestation (14.22). Jesus answers their questions, also telling them about the eschatological dwelling place and promising them the coming of the Paraclete. A monologue follows, in which Jesus speaks primarily of the Father, the Paraclete, the true vine, and the hostility of the world. At one point Jesus expresses surprise that the disciples are *not* asking further questions (16.5; cf. GThom 92 for a similar complaint). The cryptic saying, 'A little while and you will no longer see me, and again a little while and you will see me' (Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με [16.16]), prompts the disciples to ask what Jesus meant, also referring back to his earlier language about 'going to the Father' (16.17–18). The disciples put these questions *to each other*, however, being seemingly afraid to address them directly to Jesus although wishing to do so;

---

[117] Turner calls ApJohn '[t]he Sethian Revelation *par excellence*', John D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, BCNH:E 6 (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001), 69.

[118] There is debate on the unity and structure of the Johannine FD as at the end of chapter 14, Jesus says 'Rise, let us be on our way' (Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν [14.31]), but then continues to speak for another two chapters. For an overview of the various compositional theories, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*, Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New York: Yale University Press, 1970), 581–603.

but Jesus answers them anyway (16.19–24). He promises them that in the near future he will speak clearly about the Father, and the disciples then claim that he is *now* speaking openly and no longer in parables (16.25–30). The discourse is centred on the question of how the Christian community will function in the absence of its leader. The farewell discourse finishes with a narratival interjection: 'After Jesus had spoken these things' (ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς [17.1]).

(iii) Epistle of Peter to Philip (NHC 8,2; CT 1) consists of an epistolary opening, meetings of the apostles, their dialogue with Christ and a Pentecost scene. The opening has Peter inviting Philip to rejoin the apostles following a separation, and when Philip receives the letter, he gladly consents. After this point, there is no reference to the letter and the text does not conclude in epistolary form.

The group of apostles gather on the mountain, where they pray to the Father of light and the Son of life and immortality. Jesus appears as a voice emanating from a form of light. The apostles take their chance to ask him about cosmology, the human condition and salvation. Jesus answers their questions with a short paraphrase of the Sophia myth (resembling ApJohn) and explains how to overcome the archons that fight the inner man.[119] Jesus explains that he is the fullness, and was sent down to the world where he was not recognized (cf. John 1.1–18). Unlike other dialogue gospels, Jesus' revelation is not entirely new; on three occasions he reminds the disciples that they have already heard this information.

EpPetPhil is also distinctive in including multiple appearances of Jesus. After the first dialogue, he is taken up into heaven with a clap of thunder and a bolt of lightning. But he appears to the apostles twice more. When the apostles return to Jerusalem, they discuss Jesus' suffering and he speaks to them (as a voice) saying that they must suffer in front of governors and in synagogues. After this second epiphany, the disciples heal a crowd and teach in the Temple. Peter is filled with the holy spirit and preaches a sermon on Jesus' incarnation, crucifixion (he was a stranger to suffering, yet he suffered), and resurrection.[120] The third and final epiphany in the letter comprises Jesus' appearance to the apostles who have gathered again. He greets them with peace and instructs them to depart without fear, telling them that

---

[119] The Sophia myth is not fully or comprehensively explained, which may imply that the audience would have been familiar with it.

[120] Meyer notes the christological tension in Peter's sermon as he affirms the Passion of Christ whilst professing his divinity that is able to transcend suffering, Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 156.

he will be with them forever. The apostles then leave each other, going out to preach the gospel.

(iv) *Apocalypse of Peter.* ApocPet is missing from other lists of dialogue gospels, but it belongs here in view of the requests, questions or comments addressed to Jesus in its opening and closing sections – mostly stemming from Peter. It exists in two Greek fragments,[121] and a longer Ethiopic version (in two manuscripts) that is thought to be a relatively reliable translation of the original text.[122]

The Ethiopic text begins with Christ on the mount of Olives and the apostles asking him about the Parousia, the eschaton and the mission. Jesus interprets the parable of the fig tree, and declares that he will come again and that the dead will be resurrected to be judged. There follows a particularly vivid description of the fiery destruction and eternal torments for those who have fallen from faith or sinned. The punishments are specific to the crime – blasphemers are hung by their tongues, adulterers are hung up by their loins, those that lent money with interest are hung up by their knees, and disobedient slaves will chew their tongues forever. Women who have had abortions sit in a gorge of discharge and excrement with their weeping unborn children sitting opposite them. There are also insomniac worms that eat entrails, and flesh-eating birds.

Jesus then leads the apostles to a second mountain, where, in the Akhmim MS only, the Twelve ask to meet one of the deceased righteous ones (in the Greek, Jesus reveals heaven before hell). In both the Greek and Ethiopic, two of the righteous appear in a beautiful and radiant form. In the Ethiopic version, they are named as Moses and Elijah. Peter asks Jesus where the others are (named Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Ethiopic), and he shows him a paradisiacal garden. The ending is only preserved in the Ethiopic, in which Jesus ascends with Moses and Elijah. The disciples descend the mountain, praising God who has written the names of the righteous in heaven in the book of life.

---

[121] Akhmim (P. Cair. 10759) and Rainer, see Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2004).

[122] On the manuscripts of ApocPet, see Dennis D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes will be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 119–55; Robert C. Helmer, '"That We May Know and Understand": Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter' (PhD Thesis, Marquette University, 1998), 14–17.

The temporal setting is not specified at the beginning, but a post-resurrection setting is assumed in view of Jesus' ascension at the end.[123] However, the ascension account in ApocPet seems closer to the synoptic transfiguration account than to the canonical resurrection appearances.[124]

(v) First Apocalypse of James (NHC 5,3; CT 2) is largely comprised of dialogue between Jesus and James, the non-physical brothers. The first half is set before Jesus' crucifixion and the second half after his resurrection. There is no narrative to commence the text, but the setting is explained in a narrative passage in which Jesus leaves (and gets crucified), James mourns, comforts his disciples and prays, and Jesus returns. This is complemented by narrative at the end, in which James is arrested and stoned.

The topics of conversation are mostly the same before and after Jesus' death and resurrection. These include God (the pre-existent One), femaleness (Sophia and the seven female disciples) and cosmology (a body of 72 archons), but the key theme throughout both dialogues is James' concern about his own impending suffering at the hands of both the earthly rulers and the heavenly toll-collectors who demand souls. The two sets of powers are virtually indistinguishable, suggesting that earthly suffering (martyrdom) is a mirror of heavenly suffering. Jesus instructs James how to attain eschatological salvation by telling the toll-collectors that he belongs to the pre-existent Father (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.21.5). Yet, James' physical martyrdom is in no way less significant than his defeat of the cosmic powers.[125] The Codex Tchacos recension, published several decades after the Nag Hammadi version, reveals a third revelatory section (one hidden behind lacunae in the Nag Hammadi text) which states that the revelation is to be handed down to Addai, then to Manael, then to

---

[123] Helmer writes: 'Since the setting on the Mount of Olives for a post-resurrection dialogue is a common one among the apocryphal writings, it is probable that the chronological setting of Apoc. Pet, is likewise post-resurrection', Helmer, 'Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter', 55. Also, Bauckham regards it as post-resurrection due to the ascension and the command to preach the gospels, Richard Bauckham, 'The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter', *JBL* 104, no. 2 (1985): 275. *Contra*, Janssen argues that the setting is unclear, Janssen, 'Mystagogus Gnosticus?', 128.

[124] For example, the final scene takes place on 'the holy mountain' (15.1), paralleling the transfiguration account in 2 Pet 1.18. For the parallels between ApocPet 15.1–16.1 and the transfiguration accounts in Matt 17.1–9, Mark 9.2–10, Luke 9.28–36 and 2 Pet 1.18, see Helmer, 'Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter', 135–36. He concludes: 'The major different is that in Apoc. Pet., it is not Jesus who is transfigured, but rather Moses and Elijah' (136).

[125] The interrogation scene of the toll-collectors mirrors interrogation scenes in martyrdom accounts such as Polycarp's; see Mikael Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James: Martyrdom and Sexual Difference' (PhD Thesis, Harvard, 2013), 63. Haxby sees the interrogation scene as containing a number of thematic and verbal similarities to John 7–8, such as the question where Jesus has come from and is going to (John 7.27, 29; 8.24) (68–69). This will be developed in our discussion of GMary in chapter five.

Levi and finally to Levi's son who will finally communicate it to others.[126] Before this time, it is to be kept secret. Edwards sees here the original purpose of the text: 'The new [Tchacos] reading of the text leads to the conclusion that the purpose of the *First Apocalypse of James* was perhaps not originally nor solely to act as an aid in the ascension of the soul, nor to act as a catechetical tool, but rather to link the authority of the Christian lineage of Addai to James and the Jerusalem Church'.[127] Haxby, on the other hand, regards martyrdom as the central issue in the text.[128]

(vi) Apocryphon of James (NHC 1,2) is a letter penned by James to an unknown recipient,[129] containing a revelation that Jesus disclosed to James and Peter in secret. James writes that the revelation should not be communicated to many people; in fact, it is so esoteric that Jesus did not want all of his twelve disciples to receive it, and James has encrypted it by using the Hebrew alphabet. However, those who receive it and believe will be saved. James begins the story with the Twelve recalling and writing what the Saviour had taught them 'whether in secret or openly' (ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲑⲏⲡ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲛ︤ϩ︥ [2,13–14]). While James writes, Jesus appears. He tells the Twelve that only those who are filled can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and he takes James and Peter aside to 'fill them' (ⲙⲁϩⲟⲩ [2,35]). The ensuing text is a dialogue between Jesus and James and Peter, with instruction about being filled and lacking, believing in the cross, an exhortation to martyrdom and parables about the kingdom of heaven.[130]

Following the dialogue, Jesus departs and James and Peter send their hearts up to heaven, presumably to follow him. The other disciples, apparently witnessing this, call to Peter and James, asking what Jesus said and where he went. The interruption from the other disciples causes James and Peter to come back down to earth; they never reach the highest heaven, described here as 'the Majesty'. James and Peter explain that Jesus showed them a future generation of believers who will surpass and save them. The other disciples do not

---

[126] Not a lot of scholarship on 1ApocJas has been published since CT has been available to us.

[127] Edwards, 'The Rhetoric of Authority: The Nature of Revelation in the First Apocalypse of James', 66.

[128] Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James'.

[129] There is a lacuna where the name of the recipient would have stood: [----]ⲟⲥ. Williams (among others) suggests Cerinthus, F. E. Williams, 'The Apocryphon of James (I, 2)', in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. James M. Robinson (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1996), 29–31.

[130] ApJas' 'lack of the peculiarities of gnostic myth and its positive assessment of the death of Christ lead some to assign it to a non-gnostic, heterodox Christianity. On the other hand, the *editio princeps* presents varied gnostic – especially Valentinian – parallels to its content', Pheme Perkins, 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas. (NHC 1,2)', *JBL* 101, no. 3 (1982): 403. Perkins does see this text as a gnostic dialogue.

appreciate this, and so James avoids their indignation by dispersing them around the world, while he goes to Jerusalem praying that he will participate in the salvation of the generation to come.

ApJas refers to another 'apocryphon' that James has sent the recipient, one that Jesus revealed to James alone (as opposed to James and Peter). Hartenstein suggests that ApJas is referring to 1ApocJas: in both texts, James is the guarantor of a tradition that propagates martyrdom and a tradition that sees the Twelve as lesser than James. Furthermore, there are several instances in which ApJas refers to a past revelation from Jesus to James (1,28–35; 8,31–36; 13,38–14,1).[131] In 8,31–36, this previous revelation was about salvation, James' succession and what to say before the archons. Hartenstein writes: 'Das ist eine genaue Charakterisierung der lApcJas!'[132] According to Hartenstein, knowledge of 1ApocJas is the only way to make sense of these statements in ApJas.[133] If she is correct, then James must be a composite James, as he appears to be the James who belongs to the Twelve in ApJas (1,23–25) but James the brother of Jesus in 1ApocJas ($_{NHC}$ 24,13–14). Perkins, however, argues that in spite of these connections, 'the picture of martyrdom and of the death of Christ in ApocryJas comes from a different and more orthodox tradition than that behind [1ApocJas].'[134] It is more appropriate to talk about these two James texts as having close connections in the intertextual web of gospel literature, while interpreting shared traditions in different ways and even applying them to different James-characters.

*(vii) **Pistis Sophia*** (Askew Codex) is a post-resurrection dialogue in which the risen Jesus has spent 11 years explaining the mysteries to the disciples. At the beginning, Jesus tells them that he had previously taught only in general terms and there were many things he had not explained. PistSoph consists of four 'books', separated by titles on the MS.[135] The first two books mostly comprise an account of the repentances of the Pistis Sophia, largely

---

[131] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 229–32.
[132] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 230.
[133] Because of this, she argues that whereas the other dialogue gospels know and use the canonical gospels, ApJas represents a third stage in that it knows the canonical texts *and* later dialogue gospels, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 232. This could also be said for PistSoph and also perhaps any dialogue gospel that refers to the Sophia myth.
[134] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 147.
[135] As in Carl Schmidt, *Pistis Sophia*, trans. Violet MacDermot, NHMS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), xiv. Evans challenges the assumption that there were four books, writing that 'Schmidt's fourth book has a lacuna of eight pages, and the contents, themes, and even assumed cosmologies differ dramatically before and after the gap, suggesting they are parts of separate works', Erin Evans, *The Books of Jeu and the Pistis Sophia as Handbooks to Eternity: Exploring the Gnostic Mysteries of the Ineffable*, NHMS 89 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 95.

told through interpretation of Psalms. Books three and four contain Jesus answering the questions of his disciples, with a focus on the different levels of salvation for different souls. The afterlife souls will attain depends on which mysteries they had been initiated into and whether they continued to sin. Book four opens with a ritual prayer of Jesus after his resurrection, and includes prayer and ritual alongside dialogue.[136] Throughout the books, there is a heavy emphasis on forgiveness of sins and the sacraments.

PistSoph is usually dated later than other dialogue gospels, and it is only on the basis of its late date that Hartenstein excludes it from her analysis, despite acknowledging that it is an 'Erscheinungsdialog'.[137] It is also much longer than other dialogue gospels, very repetitive, and, at points, a bit of a slog (Burkitt calls it a 'dreary Egyptian book'![138]). But, in my opinion, it adds volumes to our understanding of the ways in which early Christians conceived of their world, and it should be referred to much more frequently in such discussions.[139] PistSoph is particularly interesting for the intertextual relationship between dialogue gospels and canonical texts as it contains quotations from Matthew, Luke and Romans, as well as numerous Psalms, Isaiah and the Psalms and Odes of Solomon. Furthermore, it has connections to other texts within the dialogue gospel genre, including a variation of the Sophia myth of ApJohn (where Sophia repents, although in PistSoph she belongs to the material cosmos) and Andrew's incomprehension of the ascent of the soul, as in GMary.

(viii) ***Gospel of Mary*** (BG 1, POxy 3525; PRyl 463). Following six missing pages that once opened the Berlin Codex, GMary begins with a conversation between Peter (and presumably other disciples) and the Saviour about Matter, nature and sin. A page later, after a short self-contained 'farewell discourse', Jesus disappears and Mary arises to take his place.

---

[136] Evans understands the first part of the fourth book as 'serv[ing] as a preparatory tool for someone about to undergo the first baptism', Evans, *The Books of Jeu and the Pistis Sophia*, 96.

[137] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 12, 257. *Contra,* Bockmuehl writes that it 'does not present itself as a gospel', presumably because it is instead an 'elaborate disquisition about gnostic mythology', although he does not explain, Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 194. It does not make a lot of sense for Bockmuehl to categorize GPhil as a 'post-resurrection discourse gospel' but not PistSoph.

[138] F. C. Burkitt, 'Pistis Sophia Again', *JTS* 26, no. 104 (1925): 391.

[139] With me on this is van der Vliet: 'The neglect of the *Pistis Sophia* is one of the riddles of modern Gnostic studies. W. C. van Unnik's authoritative opinion that in the *Pistis Sophia* "nicht nur Wahnsinn vorliegt, wie es beim oberflächlichen Lesen den Anschein hat" and that rather "man durch sorgfältige Einzelexegese Einblicke bekommt in die Bildung gnostischer Systeme" has hardly met with any response. Nevertheless, this compendious volume of Christian Gnostic teaching is a treasure-trove of ideas on soteriology, cosmology, eschatology and biblical exegesis', Jacques van der Vliet, 'Fate, Magic and Astrology in Pistis Sophia, Chaps 15–21', in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*, ed. A. Hilhorst and G. H. van Kooten, AGJU 59 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 519–20.

She comforts the weeping disciples, who are named as Peter, Andrew and Levi, allaying their fears about potential persecution and reminding them that Jesus will protect them. As the male disciples debate the interpretation of Jesus' words, she responds to a request from Peter by recounting how 'the Lord' appeared to her in a vision, in which he taught her about the ascent of the personified Soul through hostile cosmic powers. Following the vision (and another four-page hiatus), Peter and Andrew challenge Mary's vision. Previously-silent Levi jumps in to defend her, belittling Peter and ultimately reminding them all of the Saviour's instructions to preach the gospel. The text ends with disciples going out to fulfil those instructions, though there is considerable ambiguity about which (see the analysis of the interpretative and textual issues in chapter three).

(ix) Book of Thomas ($_{NHC}$ 2,7) is a dialogue between Jesus and Judas Thomas, Jesus' 'twin' (ⲥⲟⲉⲓϣ [138,8]). The text is ascribed to Mathaias, who was listening to the conversation between the two of them. The dialogue has no narrative frame, but the reference to Jesus' impending ascension in 138,23 indicates that it is set after Jesus' resurrection. Thomas requests that Jesus tell him about the hidden and invisible things so he can preach them. The central concern is with asceticism: the elect must abandon the fiery passions of the bestial body that destroy the soul. The body is part of the visible cosmos, and it is only through an ascetic life that one can find truth of the invisible heavenly world. The dialogue moves onto a monologue about coming judgement, heaven and hell, including woes and beatitudes, and polemic against non-ascetic Christians who have 'baptized … [their] souls in the water of darkness' (ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲱⲙⲥ̅ ... ⲛ̅ϯⲯⲭⲏ̀ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲁⲕ[ⲉ] [144,1]).

(x) Gospel of Judas ($_{CT}$ 3) is a secret discourse (ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟ[ⲥ] ⲉⲧϩⲏⲡ̀ [33,1]) that Jesus reveals to Judas shortly before Judas betrays him. The text opens with a short summary of Jesus' activity on the earth, but depicts part of this activity as appearing in different forms and passing freely between the heavens and earth. Then a setting is specified, on a certain day in Judea, as Jesus finds the disciples gathered together; it is unclear whether this is a divine 'appearance' as such.[140] Jesus laughs at the Twelve for their foolish interpretation of the eucharist, and tells them that they do not understand his true identity – he is not the son of

---

[140] According to Gathercole, Jesus came to the disciples in a 'sudden and mysterious appearance', Simon Gathercole, *The Gospel of Judas: Rewriting Early Christianity* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 67.

'their god', and they are not from the immortal holy race. Like ApJas and 1ApocJas, Jesus proclaims that the apostolic generation will not understand him. Judas recognizes Jesus' true identity, and so Jesus takes him aside and answers his cosmological and eschatological questions about the holy race and personal eschatology. Jesus reveals a cosmological myth featuring the holy and imperishable race of Seth. At the end of the text, either Judas or Jesus ascends into a cloud;[141] and then Judas betrays Jesus to the Jewish authorities for money.

After the publication of GJudas in 2006, there was debate over whether the gospel narrated Judas as saved or damned (depending partly on whether Jesus or Judas ascended into the cloud).[142] It is now generally accepted that Judas was subject to a negative fate.[143]

(xi) Dialogue of the Saviour (NHC 3,5). The majority of the fragmentary DialSav is a dialogue between Jesus and the disciples. Matthew, Judas (probably Judas Thomas) and Mary (probably Mary Magdalene) are named in the text; however, a larger group of disciples appears at certain points. There is no reference to the time or location in the extant text, which has no narrative frame. A main point within the discourse is Jesus opening the way (ϩⲓⲏ [120,24]) to the heavenly world, which reflects the Johannine reference to him as the ὁδός (14.6); thus DialSav may be intended as a farewell discourse.[144] The text begins with a monologue from the Saviour, teaching about rest and how to overcome the archons, and prayer to the Father. Four pages in, the dialogue begins, with Jesus answering the disciples' questions. In the dialogue, we find a Genesis-based creation myth (with the highest Father as creator). There is also a fragment of an apocalyptic vision of the Son of Man, heaven and hell, which the Saviour shows to Judas, Matthew and Mary.

---

[141] Ambiguities regarding the ascension will be discussed in chapter two.

[142] The disagreement over whether Judas was saved or damned, and whether Jesus instructed Judas to betray him, has resulted in a number of publications on this work – perhaps more than any in the Nag Hammadi Codices or Berlin Codex, barring GThom. Unfortunately, the other texts in Codex Tchacos have been somewhat neglected.

[143] E.g. April D. DeConick, ed., *The Codex Judas Papers: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009); Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas*; Nicola Denzey Lewis, *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Under Pitiless Skies*, NHMS 81 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013).

[144] Létourneau sees it as a farewell discourse in the Johannine model with an ambiguous chronological location, Pierre Létourneau, *Le Dialogue du Sauveur (NH III,5)*, BCNH:T 29 (Louvain: Peeters, 2003), 15. Pagels and Koester argue that it is not possible to determine whether it is meant to be a pre- or post-resurrection dialogue but that it is 'best seen as a compilation of various sources and traditions, or as the elaboration and expansion of an older dialogue', Helmut Koester and Elaine Pagels, 'Introduction', in *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*, NHMS 26 (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 1.

(xii) Epistula Apostolorum.[145] After an epistolary greeting from the eleven apostles writing to the churches of the world, the text begins with a creed-like passage and a short description of miracles performed by the incarnate Lord. The authors declare that the letter was written because of Simon and Cerinthus, the enemies of Jesus, and this is followed by a 'confessional declaration of some sort' that the Lord was crucified by Pontius Pilate and Archelaus, and buried.[146] Then, the Easter story begins: Mary (or Sarah in Ethiopic), Martha and Mary Magdalene go to the empty tomb and Jesus appears. He instructs the women to tell the apostles that he has risen, but the male disciples do not believe them. Together with the women, Jesus himself now visits the disciples, who touch him and are persuaded that he is not a ghost. At 12.3, the revelatory dialogue starts. From this point on, the women are long forgotten – presumably they are not present but their departure is not narrated. The sizeable dialogue comprises a number of questions from the apostles, who always feature as a unified 'we', on topics including the incarnation, the Parousia, the judgement, mission, keeping commandments, and an interpretation of the story of the ten virgins. The text concludes with an account of Jesus' ascension that is apparently independent of the Acts narrative.

EpAp is often seen as 'different' to other dialogue gospels. It has been viewed as a 'proto-orthodox' dialogue gospel that adopted the genre from 'gnostics' in order to criticize them.[147] The claim that the text polemizes against 'gnostics' is based on its opposition to the arch-heretics Simon and Cerinthus, and the fact that the first virgin to be locked out of heaven is named ⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ (43.16).[148] Yet EpAp also includes typically 'gnostic' elements, such as the Ogdoad and a cosmology that includes multiple heavens.[149] Another reason that Hartenstein

---

[145] There is one Coptic MS and one Latin MS of EpAp, which both contain part of the text. The full text exists in a number of Ethiopic manuscripts.

[146] Julian V. Hills, *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum*, HTS 57 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 76. In full, the passage runs: 'This one [to whom we] bear witness is the Lord, who was [crucifi]ed by Pontius Pilate [and A]rchelaus between the two robbe[r]s [and wa]s buried in a place which is called [Sku]ll' (9.1). This follows the apostles' comment on the reason for writing.

[147] Klauck, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, 159. Others who think that EpAp borrowed the genre to combat its opponents include Manfred Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*, Patristische Texte und Studien 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965), 4–8; Ron Cameron, *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster John Knox Press, 1982), 131–32; J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 555; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 182. *Contra*, Bauckham argues that the 'discourse of the risen Christ to his disciples was a popular genre among the writers of post-canonical Gospel material and was used by orthodox writers as well as (and probably before) Gnostic writers', Bauckham, 'The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter', 276.

[148] On the virgin named 'gnosis' and other possible instances of polemic throughout the text, see Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 103–4.

[149] See esp. Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 105–7.

considers EpAp as different to other dialogue gospels is in its presentation of the appearance of Christ as the resurrection of the crucified, not the appearance of the Risen One.[150] But the focus of EpAp does not seem to be on Jesus as 'the crucified one' (there are only two references to the crucifixion) but on the resurrected Jesus' corporeality. When Peter, Thomas and Andrew are asked to confirm that the risen Lord bears the marks of the crucifixion, the focus is clearly on the fleshliness of his risen state. The crucified one is not at odds with the risen one, and it might be more helpful to think of an equal importance of the crucified and risen aspects of the body of Jesus. This focus does single EpAp out from other dialogue gospels. While the argument that EpAp consciously used the genre against its 'gnostic' creators might be standard opinion, there is little sign of a polemical purpose in the text as a whole.

(xiii) **Sophia of Jesus Christ** (NHC 3,4; BG 3; POxy 1081[151]) opens with the twelve disciples and seven women on a mountain in Galilee, wondering about the universe, the plan of salvation (οικονομια), the powers and the Saviour. The Saviour appears in a form of great light that only pure, perfect flesh could bear, and greets them with his peace. Five named disciples, Philip, Matthew, Thomas, Mary and Bartholomew, or his disciples as a collective, ask him short questions, and the Saviour answers with revelation about the nature of truth, the One who is Ineffable, the perishable and the imperishable, Yaldabaoth and the cosmos, and their origins and salvation. The Sophia myth has strong connections to ApJohn. The text has a threefold pantheon: the transcendent God (which is the focus of the first part); Man (representing both saved and fallen humanity); and the Son of Man-Christ.[152] Their questions answered, the disciples go out with joy to 'preach the gospel of God, the eternal Father, imperishable for ever' (BG 127,5–10).

The usual conversation around SophJesChr presupposes that it is a Christian narrative frame imposed on the non-Christian dialogue Eugnostos (NHC 3,3; 5,1).[153] The short questions

---

[150] 'Die EpAp zeigt so schon vom Anfang der Erscheinungserzählung her ein grundsätzlich anderes Konzept als andere Dialogevangelien, behandelt wird die Auferstehung des Gekreuzigten, nicht die Erscheinung des Auferstandenen', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 113.

[151] The two Coptic MSS vary from each other in relatively minor ways.

[152] As suggested by René Falkenberg, 'Matthew 28:16–20 and the Nag Hammadi Library: Reception of the Great Commission in the Sophia of Jesus Christ', in *Mark and Matthew II: Comparative Readings, Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, ed. Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson, WUNT 304 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 99–100. Man and the Father are merged into one divinity.

[153] However, this was not always the case and previous to Krause's argument in 1964, some thought that SophJesChr may have been earlier than Eug. But 'the priority of *Eug* is now simply assumed', see D. M. Parrott,

posed by the disciples only serve to move the narrative along and nothing would be lost without the appearance, the disciples or Jesus' departure. However, the supposition concerning the manner in which SophJesChr has been 'imposed' on Eug may be too simplistic, and the whole assumption may need to be readdressed, but this is not my purpose here, and we will not deal further with Eug.[154]

1.4. Revelations of the End

1.4.1. *Revelation*

The whole point of a dialogue with Jesus is for him to teach. Dialogue gospels see knowledge as a means of salvation, whether it be knowledge of one's origins or knowledge of how to act properly. And thus, the texts' soteriological messages are interwoven with the genre.

It is often the case in the dialogue gospels that the reason for Jesus' incarnation/descent/appearance is revelation. SophJesChr repeatedly asserts that *Christ came to reveal*, without mention of any other motive (such as an atoning death): 'The perfect Saviour said: "I came from the Infinite that I might teach you all things"' (ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲓ̈ⲉⲓ̈ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲁⲡⲉⲣⲁⲛⲧⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲉⲉⲓⲉⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲛ̄ⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ [SophJesChr, ᴮᴳ 87,12–15]). The revelatory teaching can either be instigated by Jesus or by the disciples questioning him, but in every dialogue gospel it is prevalent and explicit:

ApJohn ⲧ[ⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲉⲓⲉⲓ] ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲁⲧⲕ ⲉⲃ[ⲟⲗ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ]ⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ[ⲛⲧⲁϥϣⲱ]ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲉϣ[ϣⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥ]ϣⲱⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲕ[ⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉ]ⲛⲓⲁⲧⲛⲁⲩ (ⲉ) ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄[ⲛⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩ]ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧ[ⲟⲩⲛⲉⲓⲁⲧⲕ] ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲓⲧⲉⲗⲓ[ⲟⲥ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ] (ᴮᴳ 22,2–9[155]).

[Now I have come] to teach you [what] is, and [what was] and what will come to pass, that you [may know] the things which are not manifest [and the things which are] manifest, and to teach you about the Perfect [Man].

Nag Hammadi Codices III,3–4 and V,1, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081: Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1991), 3–4.
[154] An alternative to the simplistic 'christianization' argument is seeing Christ as fulfilling the role of 'the interpreter who was sent' (ⲡⲣⲉϥⲃⲱⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲟⲩⲟϥ [BG 94,16–17]) in Eug, as suggested in Parrott, *Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ*, 4. Hartenstein is hesitant to identify the 'Interpreter' with Christ, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 38 n.22. Another issue is the translation of the title, which, on the analogy of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, might be translated 'The Wisdom of Jesus' (NHC) or 'The Wisdom of Jesus Christ' (BG), depending on whether or not 'Sophia' is taken as a proper name.
[155] Largely reconstructed from NHC 4.

John FD	Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν· ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν (16.25)

I have said these things to you in figures of speech. The hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures, but will tell you plainly of the Father.

EpPetPhil	ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲧʼⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲧⲣ̄ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉ ϫⲉ ⲁⲓⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲗ[ⲗ]ⲁ [ⲉ]ⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧʼⲁⲧʼⲛⲁϩⲧⲉ †[ⲛ]ⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲟⲡʼ· (ɴʜᴄ 135,4–8)

It is you yourselves who witness that I spoke all these things to you. But because of your unbelief, I will speak again.

ApocPet	The second coming of Christ and resurrection of the dead, which Christ revealed to Peter ... And these things he pondered so that he might understand their mystery. (incipit)

1ApocJas	[ⲉⲓⲥ] ϩⲏⲧⲉ †ⲛⲁ ϩⲱⲗⲡ̄ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲥⲱⲧⲉ (ɴʜᴄ 21,29–30,1)

Behold, I shall reveal to you your redemption.

ApJas	ⲁϩ[ⲓⲣ] ϣⲁⲣⲡ ⲉⲉⲓϣⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲣⲏⲓ̈ ϩⲛ̄ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ · ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲣ̄ ⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲛ · †[ⲛ]ⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ †ϣⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧ[ⲛ ϩ]ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ (7,1–5)

At first I spoke to you in parables, and you did not understand. Now I speak to you openly.

PistSoph	ϫⲓⲛ ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ †ⲛⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲣⲏⲥⲓⲁ ϫⲓⲛ ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲥϫⲱⲕ · ⲁⲩⲱ †ⲛⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲟ ϩⲓ ϩⲟ ⲁϫ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ · (1.6 [8,23–9,2])[156]

From today on, I will speak with you openly from the beginning of the truth until its completion. And I will speak with you face to face, without parable.

GMary	ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ †ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟϥ (10,8–9)

What is hidden from you, I will proclaim to you.

BookThom	ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϭⲱⲗⲡ̄ ⲛⲁⲕʼ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕʼⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲕʼϩⲏⲧʼ (138,7–8)

Listen to me, and I will reveal to you the things you have pondered in your mind.

GJudas	ⲁϥⲁⲣⲝ[ⲉⲓ] ⲛ̄ϣⲁ[ϫⲉ] ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲙ̄ⲙ[ⲩⲥ]ⲧⲏⲣⲓ[ⲟ]ⲛ̄ ⲉⲧϩⲓ ϫⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ϣⲁⲃⲟⲗ (33,15–18)

And he beg[an] to spe[ak] with them about the m[ys]teri[e]s above the world and what will happen up to the end.

---

[156] References to PistSoph follow the format of (chapter.section [page,verse]) as some chapters are very long. This follows the page and line numbers in Schmidt, *Pistis Sophia*.

DialSav ⲧ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲥⲁⲃⲱⲧⲛ̄ (122, 1–2)

I will teach you.

EpAp ⲧⲱ[ⲛⲉ ⲁ]ⲟⲩ ⲧ̄ⲛⲁϭⲱⲗ(ⲡ) ⲛ̄ⲏⲧⲛⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲡⲥⲁ[ϩ]ⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲁⲟⲩ
ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣ̄ⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ (12.3)

Rise [a]nd I will reveal to you the things abo[v]e the heavens and the things in the heavens
and your rest which is in the kingdom of the heavens.

SophJesChr ⲙⲁⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲛ ϩⲛ̄ⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (ᴮᴳ 102,8–9).

Teach us openly.

The theme is the same but the details vary. Some of these quotations reveal that the teaching
will be redemptive, some appear simply to placate the disciples' worries or questions, some
reveal what was previously hidden, and in some it is the disciples who ask Jesus to educate
them. In the GMary quotation above, it is Mary who speaks – she is the one who will pass on
the Saviour's teachings.

The theme of revelation goes hand in hand with understanding. Jesus often speaks
about those who have not understood (e.g. 'he who spoke concerning this scripture had a
limited understanding' [ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲋϥ̀ϣⲁϫⲉ ϩⲁ ⲧⲉⲓ̈ⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲓ̈ⲙⲁ, 1ApocJas ₙₕᶜ
26,6–7]), as well as rejoicing at the disciples' questions when they demonstrate
comprehension (e.g. 'Then he rejoiced when I asked him this, and he said to me: "Truly, you
are blessed for you have understood"' [ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁϥⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲓϫⲛⲟⲩϥ̀ ⲉⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ϫⲉ
ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲱⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ⲁⲕⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓ, ApJohn ₙₕᶜ₂ 27,14–17]).

In several of these dialogues, the disciples are confused or upset as they do not
understand Jesus' teachings:

ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲉⲓ ⲡⲁ[ϫ]ⲉϥ ϫⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲕⲣ̄ ⲡⲣⲟⲧⲣⲉⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ
ⲁⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣ̄ⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲥⲁⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲕⲥⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ· ⲡϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ· ⲙⲉⲛ ⲕⲣ̄ ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲕⲥⲱⲕ· ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕϣⲡⲱⲡ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛϩ ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲁⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲕϩⲃⲁⲣⲃⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ
ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ (ApJas 13,25–36)

Then Peter replied to these words and said, 'Sometimes you urge us toward the
kingdom of heaven, and at other times you turn us back. Lord, sometimes you
persuade and draw us to faith and promise us life, and at other times you cast us forth
from the kingdom of heaven'.

47

Incomprehension is an especially pressing problem in the dialogue gospels due to Jesus' imminent and permanent absence. We frequently find the idea that the disciples feel that it is *necessary* to question Jesus, either for purposes of salvific understanding or mission:

ⲉⲣⲧⲙ̅ⲧⲉⲟⲩ[ⲁ ⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉⲛ̅] ⲧⲁⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ· ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̅[ⲁ]ϣ ⲛ̅ϩ[ⲉ] ϥⲛⲁⲣⲱⲕϩ ⲛ̅ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧϥ̅· ⲉⲃ[ⲟⲗ] ϫⲉⲛ̅ϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉϥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ̣ (DialSav 134,1–4)

If [one] does not [understand how] fire came into existence, he will burn in it, because he does not know its root.

ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ̣ [ⲁⲛ] ⲡⲁϫⲉⲛ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲉ ⲡϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲁⲧⲛ̅ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ· ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϫⲉ ⲕⲟⲩⲁϩⲥⲁϩⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲁⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲁϣⲉⲁⲉⲓϣ (EpAp 23.1)

Again we said to him, 'Lord, it is necessary for us to question you, for you command us to preach'.

PistSoph develops this, referring to a synoptic passage (Matt 7.7 // Luke 11.9). Mary says:

ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣ̅ϭⲱⲛⲧ̅ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲉⲓ̈ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲕ· ϫⲉ ⲉⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ̅ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓⲁ· ⲁⲕϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ· ϫⲉ ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲛ̅ϭⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲱϩ̅ⲙ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϣⲓⲛⲉ ϥⲛⲁϭⲓⲛⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲧⲱϩ̅ⲙ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ· ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲁϥ· ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉϯⲛⲁϭⲛ̅ⲧϥ̅ ⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲁⲧⲱϩ̅ⲙ ⲉⲣⲟϥ· ⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ϣϭⲟⲙ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲉϫⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲡⲟⲫⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲁϣⲛ̅ⲧⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ· ⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲁϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲱⲟⲩ ... ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ̈ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡϫⲓⲥⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲟⲛ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧϭⲓⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲧⲃ̅· ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲕⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧⲥ̅· ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣ̅ϭⲱⲛⲧ̅ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϭⲱⲗⲡ̅ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̅ⲡϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉϯⲛⲁϣⲛ̅ⲧⲕ ⲉⲣⲟϥ· (2.83 [184,7–19; 185,2–9])

My Lord, be not angry with me that I question you, for we question all things with assurance and certainty. For you once said to us, 'Seek and you shall find, and knock and it shall be opened to you, for everyone who seeks will find, and to everyone who knocks, it will be opened to him'. Now at this time, my Lord, whom will I find, or to whom shall we knock, or rather who is able to say to us the answer to the words on which we question you, or rather who knows the power of the words which we will question? … For we do not question in the way that the people of the world question,

but we question with the knowledge of the height that you have given to us, and we question with the type of the superior questioning that you have taught us, that we should question therewith. Now at this time, my Lord, do not be angry with me, but reveal to me the subject on which I will question you.

Jesus answers and says that he is glad to answer her questions since she has asked them in the right way (with assurance).

The request for the revelatory teaching that Jesus must provide can be relentless (especially when the disciples never quite grasp the point). In the quotation above, Mary twice asks Jesus not to be angry with her for her questions, and even attempts to justify her own questioning methods. The disciples of EpAp explain that they need answers because Jesus has commanded them to preach (23.1), but he still gets irate with their relentless questioning:

[ⲁϥⲃ]ⲱⲗⲕ ⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲉϥϫⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲉⲛ ϫⲉ ⲱ ⲛⲁⲧⲡⲓ[ⲥⲧⲓⲥ]ⲅⲏⲙ ϣⲁ ⲉϩ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲓⲛⲉ (EpAp 24.4)

[He was a]ngry with us, saying to us, 'O you of little faith, how long will you question?'

In spite of all the differences in the theological content of the revelations, the dialogue gospels depict a similar relationship between Jesus and his disciple(s). Jesus is the revealer and saviour, and the disciples desperately need him to reveal the truths of their salvation.

1.4.2. *The Revealer*

With the focus on revelation, we must also consider who the revealer is. Of course it is Jesus, but it is not a given that every interpretation of Jesus was the same – even remotely. Each gospel, both canonical and non-canonical, offers a new interpretation of Jesus.[157]

---

[157] As Watson writes: 'As Luke indicates to Theophilus, each attempt to write the gospel represents a new answer to the question who Jesus is on the assumption that the answers embodied in earlier gospels are either inadequate or misleading', Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 8. Conversely, Perkins argues that '[t]he Nag Hammadi writings have developed their picture of the Savior from traditions quite different from those which underlie NT christological assertions', Pheme Perkins, 'Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament', *CBQ* 43, no. 4 (1981): 606. However, King points out that the Saviour in 'gnostic' texts is depicted in radically different ways, King, *What Is Gnosticism?*, 208–10.

In the dialogue gospels, we find a variety of christological titles. In general, they show a predominant use of the names ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ and ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ with ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ as a rarity; so much so that there may be some intention behind the authors' repeated preference. Irenaeus challenges his opponents' preference for 'Saviour':

And for this reason, they say that the 'Saviour' – for they do not wish to call him 'Lord' – for 30 years did nothing in public. (*Adv. Haer.* 1.1.3)

Although Irenaeus is incorrect, for his opponents' texts do wish to call Jesus Lord, he is right to point out the different emphasis in titles between his four authoritative gospels and 'other gospels'.[158] In the dialogue gospels, ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ and ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ are generally employed in *dialogue*, particularly in the introductory formulae 'the Saviour said' and 'the Lord said'. The two names are alternated in ApocPet (alongside 'my Lord Jesus Christ' [15.1] and 'my Lord and God Jesus Christ' [16.4]), BookThom (alongside 'Jesus'), DialSav, EpAp and SophJesChr. 1ApocJas does not use Saviour at all, only Lord (and Rabbi as an address). The name 'Jesus' is relatively uncommon. PistSoph appears to be the least hesitant of the dialogue gospels to employ it: in book three, the names Jesus and Saviour are used alternately, in book one and four he is Jesus, and in book two he is called the First Mystery but reverts to Jesus at the end.

Irenaeus' criticism that the 'gnostics falsely called' welcomed the name Saviour suggests that the members of his 'proto-orthodox' community did not. Again, this is not quite accurate. Not only is it found in EpAp and ApocPet, but it is employed by a number of second-century 'orthodox' authors who write texts outside of the dialogue gospel genre. POxy 840 is similar to the canonical gospels in style and tone and deals with an encounter between the Saviour and a Pharisee about ritual cleanliness and baptism. Although it is just a small fragment of a text, it uses σωτήρ exclusively. Bovon argued that this was evidence of intra-Christian polemic, writing that the 'use of the title Savior and the absence of the name Jesus suggest a location for the fragment within a Gnostic or Manichaean milieu using apocryphal tradition'.[159] Again, this cannot be correct. Ignatius frequently refers to Jesus

---

[158] We can assume ApJohn represents a text of Irenaeus' opponents due to the close parallels between ApJohn and *Adv. Haer.* 1.29–30.

[159] François Bovon, 'Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840, Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity', *JBL* 119, no. 4 (2000): 728. *Contra*, Kazen argues against POxy 840 being closer to Christian 'gnostic' or Manichaean ideas than the synoptics and Jewish texts regarding purity. See Thomas Kazen, 'Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts', *NTS* 51, no. 4 (2005): 575. Kruger simply argues that this title places the gospel in the second century,

Christ as Saviour,[160] and Justin hardly shies away from it, telling us that 'the name Jesus in the Hebrew language means Σωτήρ in the Greek tongue' (*1 Apol.* 33.7).[161] The 'Saviour' title then need not imply a specifically 'gnostic' theology. It is more appropriate to suggest that the title refers to Jesus' *saving* capacity – through his death and resurrection in the case of Ignatius, through purity in the case of POxy 840, and through revelation in the case of the dialogue gospels.

'Lord' (κύριος // ϫοεις) is much more common in early Christian literature and is multifaceted in meaning.[162] Yet it is not entirely welcomed in some recensions of the Nag Hammadi tractates. The two recensions of SophJesChr (BG, NHC 3) and four recensions of ApJohn (NHC 2, 3, 4, BG) show a striking difference in their use of christological titles. For SophJesChr, in both recensions, it is the 'Saviour' who appears to the disciples and he is usually called 'the perfect Saviour' in the dialogue narratives. However, in the NHC 3 version, Philip, Thomas and Mary address him as 'Lord' ($\overline{\text{ϫc}}$)[163] whereas the parallel passages in BG use 'Christ' ($\overline{\text{xc}}$).[164] Of all the things to change between manuscripts, the name used to address the Saviour is significant.

The Coptic nomina sacra used for 'Christ' and 'Lord' are very similar, with just a single line difference ($\overline{\text{ϫc}}$ and $\overline{\text{xc}}$). This may suggest that the variation is a simple mistake or misreading. However, later the text makes clear that human error is not the explanation. The Saviour is teaching the disciples and we read:

ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉϣⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ (NHC 105,19–22).

The whole kingdom of the Son of Man, who is called 'Son of God'.

Michael J. Kruger, *The Gospel of the Savior: An Analysis of P.Oxy. 840 and Its Place in the Gospel Traditions of Early Christianity*, TENT 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), esp. 203–4.

[160] Epistles to the *Ephesians* 1.1; *Magnesians* 1.1; *Philadelphians* 9.2; *Smyrnaeans* 7.1.

[161] Furthermore, 2 Peter and the Pastoral epistles employ it frequently. 2 Pet 1.1, 11; 2.20; 3.2, 18; Tit 1.3, 4; 2.10, 13; 3.4, 6; 1 Tim 1.1; 2.3; 4.10 and 2 Tim 1.10.

[162] See Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 108–17; Ferdinand Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*, trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg, Library of Theological Translations (Cambridge: James Clarke Co., 2002), 68–128; Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely, 5th ed. (Nashville, TN and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970), 121–52.

[163] BG 86,7; 87,9; 90,1–2.

[164] NHC3 95,19; 96,15; 98,10. In the BG, ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲙⲁⲑⲑⲁⲓⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲱⲥ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ (Matthew said to him, 'How was Man revealed?' [BG 93,12–15]) follows the exact same format as the other questions, but there is no address. NHC 3, on the other hand, does have an address: ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲙⲁⲑⲑⲁⲓⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ· ⲡⲱⲥ ⲁⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (Matthew said to him, 'Lord, Saviour, how was Man revealed?' [100,16–19]).

ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̅ (BG 101,6–9).

Now the kingdom is that of the Son of Man, who is called 'Christ'.

The change from Son of God to Christ (or vice versa) cannot be explained as a misreading of ⲭ and ⲝ. It must be more intentional.

In ApJohn, we see the same thing. John repeatedly addresses Jesus as 'Christ' in BG and 'Lord' in NHC 2 and 3.[165] Yet, except in direct address, he is called the 'Saviour'. Evidently, the scribe of the Berlin Codex thought Christ was an appropriate title for the Saviour; whereas the scribes of these texts in Nag Hammadi Codices 2 and 3 pushed against this identification.[166]

The motivations behind the variant christological titles are unclear. What is clear, however, is that the christological titles in dialogue gospels reflect the fluctuating titles within the wider Christian world. Lord, Saviour, Jesus and Christ are four key titles, and we see these within dialogue gospels and outside of them. The presentation of Jesus is no more or less varied within dialogue gospels than within 'orthodox' or 'heterodox' Christian literature – dialogue gospels are simply using common early Christian terminology.

1.4.3. *Eschatology*

The revelations of Jesus in the dialogue gospels are generally concerned with the broad concepts of eschatology and soteriology. In these texts, eschatology and soteriology are not easily distinguished – salvation is the final aim of humanity – and to encompass both the cosmic and individual 'end', our discussion will be conceived in terms of 'eschatology'. Even the texts that focus on one's origins are soteriological. Hartenstein notes that the form of the dialogue gospel, especially the lists of questions, mirrors its concern with revelatory salvation: 'Die Beliebtheit der Fragelisten ist im Kontext gnostischer Theologie zu verstehen. Da Erkenntnis, insbesondere das Wissen um die eigene Herkunft, Heil bedeutet, hat Suchen

---

[165] E.g. BG 46,6 // NHC2 13,18; BG 58,2 // NHC2 22,10 // NHC3 28,18. There are many more instances of this. In some cases, it is unclear whether ⲭⲥ̅ is in reference to Christ or Good; e.g. he anointed him with his ⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲭⲥ̅ (Christhood Χριστός, or goodness χρηστός) (BG 30,15)

[166] This is not the case for other texts in NHC 2 and 3. GPhil in NHC 2 and the *Gospel of the Egptians* in NHC 3 use 'Christ'.

und Fragen einen hohen Stellenwert; es kann sogar schon für sich soteriologische Qualität haben'.[167]

As we saw earlier, Fallon divided the 'gnostic apocalypses' into those which included cosmic eschatology and those which included only personal. The dialogue gospels do not neatly bifurcate into these two categories, as in several texts a cosmic eschatology can at least be inferred – although it is not a primary concern of the text, it is in the background. Often it is simply said that the cosmos is perishable (e.g. SophJesChr [$_{BG}$ 89,9–12], GJudas [50,11–14]). Others texts deal with this theme more explicitly. In GMary the disciples ask about the dissolution of Matter (7,1–2). In PistSoph, it is said that 'world matter' (ⲑⲩⲗⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ) will 'dissolve completely' (ϥⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣ︦ϥ︦) (2.93 [212,22–23]). The disciples see this as the work of Jesus, as when he ascends to heaven an earthquake occurs and the disciples wonder if the world will 'be rolled up' (ⲉⲩⲛⲁϭⲟ︦ⲗ︦-ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ [1.3 (6,14)]) and whether Jesus will 'dissolve all places' (ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ [1.4 (7,4)]). ApJohn, concerned primarily with origins over eschatology, sees a protological end: 'It is because of you [the Invisible Spirit] that all things have come into being, and (it is) to you (that) all things will return' (ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧⲕ` ⲁⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ` ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲛⲁⲛⲁϩⲩ︦ϥ` ⲉⲣⲟⲕ [$_{BG}$ 9.7-8]). DialSav refers to the 'time of dissolution' (ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [122,3]), and later to 'weeping and [gnashing] of teeth over the end of a[ll] these things' (ⲡⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ [ⲡ ...] ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲃϩⲉ ⲉϫⲛ̄ⲑⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲧⲏ[ⲣⲟⲩ] [127,17–19]). ApocPet also refers to the whole creation dissolving (5.7), which brings judgement and the Parousia. Cosmic eschatology is a less pressing concern in the dialogue gospels than individual salvation; however, sometimes they are complementary. In the background of Jesus' teaching about the ascent of the soul through the archons, or the resurrection of the flesh to the judged, is a dissolving cosmos.

Hartenstein groups together ApJohn, SophJesChr, GMary and 1ApocJas (and to an extent EpPetPhil), seeing that they have a similar cosmology and report similar conditions of the creation of humankind:

Diese mythologischen Ausführungen sind vor dem Hintergrund zu verstehen, daß Wissen um himmlische Vorgänge und vor allem um die eigene Herkunft erlösend wirkt. Solches Wissen ermöglicht den Aufstieg des Menschen bzw. seiner Seele, der in SJC (BG p.122,5–125,10 par.) und AJ (BG p.64,14–71,2 par.) ausdrücklich

---

[167] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 278.

thematisiert wird. Im EvMar und in der lApcJac findet sich eine Konzentration auf den Aspekt des Aufstiegs, was aber nur eine Verschiebung des thematischen Schwerpunkts bedeutet. Die Dialogevangelien als Gattung scheinen so eine Affinität zu Fragen der (gnostisch verstandenen) Soteriologie zu haben.[168]

SophJesChr explains that Jesus has broken the bonds of the archons by teaching humanity about the Immortal Man. Now humanity can 'go up to the One Who Is' (ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ [BG 122,13–15]). Knowledge allows humanity to ascend to the Father. ApJohn also discusses how knowledge and action allow the soul to ascend. In short, ApJohn conjectures a transcendent God whose divine essence is protologically given to humans made in its image. Once humans understand their divine heritage, they become free from 'fate' and can be saved (unlike Judas in GJudas whose fate dooms him beyond salvation[169]). 1ApocJas explains how the soul ascends through the archons by declaring its divine heritage, and in GMary we see this ascent narrated. Although not all of these texts presuppose the 'Sophia myth' of ApJohn, they each understand salvation and personal eschatology as protological: The soul returns to its origins. This group may be extended to include PistSoph, in which all souls ascend at the end of age, but the individual soul will only reach the realm according to which it has received the mysteries. The ascent is therefore conditional and hierarchical. In ApJohn and PistSoph, souls that have not received the mysteries or correct knowledge, or have acted out of accordance with them, have the prospect of reincarnation.

ApJas presupposes knowledge of this kind of soul-through-archons eschatology, although the text is not interested in reproducing that teaching:

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲉⲓ ϯϫⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲓ ⲛⲏⲫⲉ· ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲣ· ⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ ⲁϩⲓ̈ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲣⲏⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧⲕ̄· ⲱ ⲓ̈ⲁⲕⲕⲱⲃⲟⲥ ⲁϩⲓ̈ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲓ̈ϩⲱⲛ ⲁⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ̄· ⲁⲧⲣⲉⲕⲟⲩⲁϩⲕ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲓ̈ⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉ ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲕ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲑⲩⲡⲟⲑⲉⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲁϩⲓ̈ⲉⲓ ⲁⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲓ̈ϣⲉϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩ<ⲓ̈>ⲣ̄ ⲥⲕⲩⲗⲗⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲓ̈ϥⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲕⲗⲁⲙ· ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲛⲟⲩϩⲙ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲁϩⲓ̈ⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲧⲣⲁⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲛ̄ⲙⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ· ⲉ<ⲣⲉⲧ>ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲓ̈ ϩⲱⲧ· ⲧⲏⲛⲉ (ApJas 8,27–9,4)

This is why I say to you: Be sober, do not be deceived. And many times have I said to you all together, and also to you alone, James, have I said 'Be saved.' And I have commanded you to follow me, and I have taught you what to say before the archons. Observe that I have descended and have spoken and undergone tribulation and carried off my crown after saving you. For I came down to dwell with you so that you in turn might dwell with me.

Reading ApJas alone, it is unclear who or what the archons are. But reading it in light of texts such as GMary and 1ApocJas, it can be assumed that they are the cosmic powers that the soul must conquer on its way to heaven, mirrored in the earthly realm as authorities that persecute Christians. ApJas explicitly links this to its incarnation theology: Jesus has descended from the heavens and been crucified in order that Christians can dwell with him in the heavens, presumably after producing the necessary verbal declarations to pass the cosmic powers.

This cosmic/earthly powers parallelism is typical of the 'martyrdom' dialogue gospels. Alongside ApJas, these are 1ApocJas and EpPetPhil.[170] In 1ApocJas, James prepares for martyrdom, and the text concludes with his death by stoning at which he imitates Jesus, crying: 'Forgive them, for they do [not know] what they are doing' (ⲕⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̅ⲥ̅[ⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ]ⲛⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ [ⲁⲛ] ϫⲉ ⲉⲩⲣ ⲟⲩ [ᴄᴛ 30,25–26]). James prepares for martyrdom by acquiring knowledge about the heavenly realms and, as Haxby argues, 'by focusing so deeply on the revelation which James receives, *1ApocJas* narrates a martyrdom which focuses far more on the transmission of knowledge than on the testing and trial of the hero martyr'.[171] In the opening of EpPetPhil, the apostles ask Jesus to 'give us our power, for they seek to kill us' (ⲙⲁϯ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛⲛⲟⲩϭⲁⲙ ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ⲥⲉⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲧⲃⲛ [ɴʜᴄ 134,8–9]). Throughout the text, Jesus tells them that their suffering is necessary. The potential persecution is related to mission, but there are also cosmic powers that they must fight against. The earthly martyrdom, in which the disciple battles the authorities and dies, is paralleled in the cosmos, where the disciple battles the archons and gains immortality.

---

[170] These are both found in Codex Tchacos and King proposes that, along with GJudas, these texts could be read together as preparation for martyrdom, Karen L. King, 'Marytrdom and Its Discontents in the Tchacos Codex', in *The Codex Judas Papers: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex Held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008*, ed. April D. DeConick (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 23–42.

[171] Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James', 14. He focuses on how James prepares for martyrdom through gaining knowledge about the heavens and femaleness, and thus sees it as a 'non-standard martyrdom'.

In EpAp, BookThom and ApocPet, humankind must face judgement and heaven or hell. In EpAp and ApocPet, judgement is linked with the Parousia.[172] In ApocPet, Christ will return 'on a cloud of heaven with great power and in my glory, my cross going before my face... shining seven times more than the sun... that I might judge the living and the dead' (1.6–7). In EpAp he says:

ϯⲛⲏⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧϩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲓ ⲉⲧⲡⲣⲓⲱⲟⲩ ⲁⲟⲩ ⲉⲉⲓⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲕⲱⲃ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲣⲁϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲉⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲧⲛ̄ϩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ϩⲓ[ⲟⲩⲥ]ⲁⲡϩⲁⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲥⲏⲙⲉⲓ̣ⲟⲛ [ⲛ̄ⲡⲥ]ⲧ̣ⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲁⲉϩⲓ ⲁⲟⲩ ϯⲛⲏⲩ ⲁϩⲣⲏⲓ̈ ⲁⲭⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲁϯϩⲉⲡ ⲁⲛⲉⲧⲁⲛϩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲁⲩⲧ (EpAp 16.3–5)

I am coming like the sun that shines, and the light will be seven times greater than it, in my glory. On the wings of clouds, I shall be carried in glory, the sign of the cross before me. And I am coming down upon the earth and I give judgement to the living and the dead.

Both texts describe clouds, glory, the cross, light seven times more powerful than the sun, and portray the Christ as the 'judge of the living and the dead'.[173]

EpAp, ApocPet and BookThom all propose a judgement, but in EpAp and ApocPet, this is linked with resurrection (EpAp 21.6; ApocPet 1.8, 4.1, 4.12). In BookThom, there is a passing reference to 'the day of judgement' (143,7), but without explanation. It must be conceived differently to EpAp and ApocPet as the idea of resurrection is contested – in BookThom, it is the soul alone that is punished. The text makes it clear that flesh will never rise again: 'Now that which changes will decay and perish, and has no hope of life from them on, since that body is bestial' (ⲡⲉⲧϣⲓⲃⲉ ⲇⲉ ϥⲛⲁⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲛ̄ϥⲱⲭⲛ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥ ϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲱⲛϩ ⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲧⲃ̄ⲛⲏ ⲡⲉ [139,4–6]), and 'the vessel of their flesh will dissolve' (ⲡⲥⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [141,6–7]). Humans love the material world made of fire, but it is the fire that will consume those who loved it.

The all-consuming fire is an intertextual motif between BookThom and ApocPet:

---

[172] The question of dependency (EpAp on ApocPet) has been raised, but as Bauckham writes: 'the *Epistle of the Apostles* seems to show no other sign of dependence on the *Apocalypse of Peter*. It is at least equally likely that both works reflect common traditional descriptions of the parousia', Bauckham, 'The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter', 274.

[173] Helmer writes that 'judge of the living and the dead' 'quickly became codified as a stock phrase in the creedal formulas of the early Church', Helmer, 'Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter', 82. The NT uses it in Acts 10.42, 2 Tim 4.1 and 1 Pet 4.5.

[…] ϩⲉⲛ`ⲫⲣⲁⲅⲉⲗⲗⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲧⲉ` ⲉⲩⲛⲉϫ ⲧ̄ⲕ̄ ⲧⲕ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ` ⲉϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ) [ϩ]ⲛ̣̄ ⲫⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲡⲏⲧ` ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ`
ⲉϥⲡⲏⲧ` ⲁⲡⲁⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲉϥϭⲓ[ⲛ]ⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥⲁⲧⲉ` ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲕⲧⲟϥ` ⲁⲣⲏⲥ ⲉϥϭⲛ̄ⲧⲥ̄ ⲟⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲕⲧⲟϥ
ⲁϩⲏⲧ` ϣⲁⲥⲧⲱⲙⲧ ⲉⲣⲟϥ` ⲁⲛ` ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲧⲁⲡⲓⲗⲏ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲧⲉ` ⲉⲥⲃⲣ̄ⲃⲣ̄ ⲙⲁϥϭⲓⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓⲏ
ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲃⲧⲉ ⲁⲡⲱⲧ` ⲉⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϥⲟⲩ ϫⲁⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥϭⲛ̄ⲧⲥ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲫⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥϩⲛ̄ ⲥⲱⲙ[ⲁ] ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ
ⲉϥⲛⲁϭⲛ̄ⲧⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ` (BookThom 143,1–7)

… fiery scourges that cast a shower of sparks into the face of the one who is pursued.
If he flees westward, he finds the fire. If he turns southward, he finds it there as well.
If he turns northward, the threat of seething fire meets him again. Nor does he find the
way to the east so as to flee there and be saved, for he did not find it in the day he was
in the body, so that he might find it in the day of judgement.

And so as soon as the whole creation dissolves, the men that are in the east shall flee
to the west, <and those who are in the west> to the east; those in the south shall flee to
the north, and those who are in the north to the south. And in all places shall the wrath
of a fearful fire overtake them; and an unquenchable flame driving them shall bring
them to the judgement of wrath, to the stream of unquenchable fire that flows,
flaming with fire, and when its waves part themselves one from another, burning,
there shall be a great gnashing of teeth among the children of men. (ApocPet 5.7–9)[174]

The extensive fire acts as a barricade in both of these texts, also being linked with judgement.
However, BookThom uses this motif to promote its ascetic ideology: non-ascetic Christians
are pursued by fire as a reflection of their desire for material things. In ApocPet, fire acts to
drive sinners towards judgement.

Torments of hell is another common thread within the theme of eschatology in
BookThom, EpAp and ApocPet. In BookThom, those who love their beastly nature and those
who sneer at the Christian message will be thrown down to the abyss and tormented, not
being able to move, and if they try to flee they will be met with fire (141,33–35; 142,26–
143,13). Here there is a long list of 'woe' proclamations to those who have not understood
the true nature of the material world. In ApocPet, the bulk of the text is a vision of the
punishments of sinners, as described earlier. EpAp does not focus on the fate of sinners so

---

[174] This translation comes from J. K. Elliott, 'The Apocalypse of Peter' in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 593–612.

much – we are told that the one who did not keep Jesus' commandments will remain outside the kingdom and 'he will be terribly tortured and lacerated and torn apart with a great punishment [and he will] be in agony' (44.4).[175] In contrast to ApocPet, there is nothing else grotesque.

Another text that incorporates torments is ApJohn, which present them as an alternative to the ascending soul or reincarnation. It is said of the souls that knew the All (presumably the God above the demiurge), but turned away from it:

ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲁⲣⲉⲋ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲋⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲕⲟⲗⲁⲍⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲡⲉⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅
ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲃⲁⲥⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ (BG 70,16–71,2)
They will be kept for the day on which everyone who has blasphemed the Holy Spirit will be punished. They will be tortured with eternal punishment.

The inclusion of this sentiment in ApJohn shows that eschatological teaching is not an either/or of ('heterodox') ascending souls or ('orthodox') eternal punishment; nor does it reflect a text's theology or christology.

The concept of salvation diverges in ApocPet and EpAp, but EpAp's eschatological heaven brings together several other dialogue gospels. In ApocPet, the Akhmim fragment describes a large, light, sunny place. It is a great sensory experience, with a powerful scent of unfading flowers, spices and fruit plants. The inhabitants are dressed in shining clothes and walk among angels (15–20). Conversely, the picture of heaven in EpAp is devoid of sensory experience – it is described in terms of being a place without eating or drinking, sorrow or singing, earthly clothing or decay (19.13–15). It is described as 'Rest' (ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ [12.3, 19.14, 26.5]). A similar concept of Rest is in GMary (17,15), EpPetPhil (NHC 137,10), DialSav (120,5–8) and BookThom (145,8–16).

Certain eschatological themes are common throughout the diverse group of dialogue gospels. Each is concerned with individual salvation, whether it be Rest, reincarnation or resurrection. Often a dissolving cosmos is in the background, which may directly affect the individual or play two separate parts of a larger eschatological scheme. Despite these divergences, the texts converge in their focus on Christ as the way to salvation.

---

[175] The translation follows the Ethiopic text. The Coptic corresponds but there are lacunae: ⲥⲉ[ⲛⲁ]ⲧϩⲙⲕⲟ ⲛ̄ⲙⲁϥ ⲕⲁⲕ ⲓⲛⲁ ⲁϥ[ⲛⲁ .. ⲁⲟⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲗⲁⲍⲉ] ⲛ̄ⲙⲁϥ ϩⲛ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩ [ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲁⲟⲩ ϥⲛⲁ]ϩⲱ ⲡⲉ ϩⲁ ⲃⲁⲥⲁⲛⲟⲥ (37.5–8). Schmidt's restoration of the Coptic text does not sufficiently take the Ethiopic into account, and so his reconstructions are often unreliable.

Conclusion

The 13 dialogue gospels chosen to be part of our genre have as much and as little in common with each other as they do with other early Christian literature and especially the canonical gospels. There are many points of divergence within the genre, such as the unremitting validation of the resurrected Christ (EpAp) contrasted with a complete denial of ongoing life for any material body (BookThom). Yet, they are all shaped around Christ as revealer, who reveals the various truths of eschatological salvation to the disciples as he is about to leave them forever. These themes utilize the dialogue gospel genre, as much as the texts within the genre focus on the themes. Jesus is revealer; dialogue ensures revelation. The revealer is about to depart from his disciples and so the disciples need a full understanding of the salvation they are to proclaim to the world.

In order to discover the most fruitful connections of the dialogue gospels to each other and to the canonical texts (as is the subject of the next chapter), I have proposed that we adopt an 'open' view of genre. Pigeonholing texts into one category or another hinders discovering links between texts that might not otherwise be obvious. Texts do not fit into one box; they can be many things. A single text can be a gospel, a letter, a dialogue and an apocalypse, and can include monologues, visions, and much more, and a decision on which possibility to emphasize will reflect the interests of the individual interpreter. Accepting and appreciating that early Christian texts may participate in more than one genre will lead to a clearer picture of the world that surrounds them.

Chapter Two

Why write a Dialogue Gospel? Dialogue Gospels and the New Testament

For all their diversity, at the heart of each dialogue gospel stands Jesus. Jesus is the revealer and saviour. All gospels are inspired by this figure, whether they narrate his life, death and resurrection, recount his sayings, or describe him answering his disciples' questions. The same traditions that influenced Matthew, Mark, Luke/Acts, John and even the Pauline epistles stand behind the dialogue gospels. The themes, thoughts, motifs and linguistic connections shared between certain dialogue gospels and certain New Testament texts will be the subject of this chapter.

Why an early Christian might write a dialogue gospel is a difficult question to answer. Any number of personal, sociological and theological reasons could be proposed. But looking to the texts that came to be in the New Testament might act as a starting point for seeing how the dialogue gospels developed. Hartenstein's view that the dialogue gospels presupposed the canonical gospels, and were intended as a 'second teaching' to supplement or surpass them, is a helpful starting point.[1] Issues of dependence are not at stake here,[2] but rather the question will be framed around the concerns shared between the canonical texts and dialogue gospels and how they are answering the same questions similarly or differently. These concerns might be about Jesus' departure and its consequences, the physical nature of his resurrection, or overcoming the powers and principalities that dwell between earth and heaven. Comparisons between the two groups of texts can be made in general or specific ways, and both similarities and differences may be highlighted so as to establish connections between dialogue gospels and canonical texts. Such comparisons may also result in new exegetical insights into the individual texts.

---

[1] It is not correct to presume that all of the dialogue gospels knew one or four canonical gospels, or any of Paul's letters, or other canonical writings. For questions regarding sources, each dialogue gospel would have to be taken on its own terms and analyzed in relation to the New Testament texts. However, it may be assumed that dialogue gospels are later than the canonical gospels and Pauline epistles and show evidence of sharing the traditions within them.

[2] For studies with this aim, see e.g. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Nag Hammadi and The Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986); Lorne R. Zelyck, *John among the Other Gospels: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Extra-Canonical Gospels*, WUNT II 347 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

2.1. The Johannine Farewell Discourse (John 13.31–17.1)

As was shown in the previous chapter, the Johannine FD resembles other dialogue gospels so much so that it was included in our genre. To exclude it on the basis that it is also part of a *bios* gospel would be detrimental to the 'open' view of genre desirable for comparative analysis. Yet, it may also be considered a precursor to other texts in question-and-answer format that are similarly concerned with Jesus' departure and how to act in his absence.

The intertextual links between John FD and other dialogue gospels are not just thematic but include verbal overlaps. The peace-saying of John 14.27 (εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν) occurs in several farewell scenes stretching across canonical and non-canonical gospels, including Luke (24.36), John (20.19, 21, 26), SophJesChr (BG 79,10–12) and GMary (8,14–15). In spite of the divergent temporal setting, the pre-crucifixion farewell in John 14 and post-resurrection greeting in the other examples serve the same purpose. Zelyck, while focusing on the differences, concedes that 'the context of John 14:27 may not be entirely different from the *Soph. Jes. Chr.*, since the Farewell Discourses (John 14:1–17:26) mark Jesus' departure from the disciples by his death, as well as his departure to the Father by ascension'.[3] And so, instead of focusing on the differences between John FD and the post-resurrection accounts as Zelyck does, the peace saying might be better used to highlight their similarity. In all of these settings, Jesus pronounces peace to his disciples in the setting of departure.

Perkins sees particularly close parallels between John FD and ApJas, arguing that ApJas is 'very much dependent upon the Johannine farewell discourses to answer orthodox objections [to its theology]'.[4] ApJas does appear to counter another Christian narrative (it essentially condemns the apostolic generation [15,34–16,1]), but Perkins' claim that the author 'creates a *gnostic* farewell discourse'[5] is not so helpful. Earlier scholarship did not regard ApJas as 'gnostic', in view of its christological narrative, disdain for prophecy (6,21–31) and enthusiasm for martyrdom (4,23–6,18)[6] – and that was at a time when 'gnosticism'

---

[3] Zelyck, *John among the Other Gospels*, 146.
[4] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 151. She sees similarities too with 1ApocJas, in that 1ApocJas describes Jesus' relationship with the highest God, his mission in making God known and his ascent and return. In both texts Jesus warns the disciples that they will suffer and speaks of a Paraclete figure (which is James himself in 1ApocJas), Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 143.
[5] Perkins, 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas.', 408.
[6] See W. C. van Unnik, 'The Origin of the Recently Discovered "Apocryphon Jacobi"', *VC* 10, no. 3 (1956): 149–56. He argues that ApJas originates from a small village church in Egypt that has not been affected by 'gnosticism'.

still seemed an unproblematic category. It is better to understand it, as Brakke does, not as 'gnostic', Valentinian or as belonging to the Thomasine Syrian tradition (the categories into which much of the NHC has been split) but as an example of 'unclassified Christian apocrypha' with links to the hermeneutics and soteriology of Clement and Origen.[7]

At the beginning of the conversation between the risen Jesus and the Twelve in ApJas, we find clear analogies to John FD:[8]

ApJas	John
ⲡⲁϫⲉⲛ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲕⲃⲱⲕ ⲁⲕⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲁⲣⲁⲛ (2,22) We said to him, 'Have you gone and departed from us?'	Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· κύριε, ποῦ ὑπάγεις; (13.36) Simon Peter said to him, 'Lord, where are you going?' νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐρωτᾷ με· ποῦ ὑπάγεις; (16.5) But now I am going to him who sent me; yet none of you asks me, 'Where are you going?'
ⲓⲏⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲉϥ ϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲉ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϯⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲁⲡⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϩ̈ⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ (2,23–24) Jesus said, 'No, but I will go to the place from which I came.'	τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι· (13.33) Little children, I am with you only a little longer. πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (14.28) I am going to the Father. ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. (16.28) I came from the Father and have come into the world; again, I am leaving the world and am going to the Father.
ϣⲡⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ· ⲉⲉⲓ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲛⲉⲓ ⲁⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ (2,25–26) If you wish to come with me, come.	ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον (13.36) Where I am going, you cannot follow me now; but you will follow afterward.

---

[7] David Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James', *JECS* 7, no. 2 (1999): 203.

[8] For an extensive chart of these parallels, see Perkins, 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas.', 408–10.

	ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν; καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. καὶ ὅπου [ἐγὼ] ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν. (14.2–4) In my Father's house, there are many dwelling places. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, so that where I am, there you may be also. And you know the way where I am going.
ⲁ̅ⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̅ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲁϫⲉⲩ ϫⲉ ϣⲡⲉ ⲕⲣ̅ ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲅⲉ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲏⲟⲩ (2,26–28) They all answered and said: 'If you command us, we come'.	λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω. (13.37) Peter said to him, 'Lord, why can I not follow you now? I will lay down my life for you.'
ⲡⲁϫⲉϥ ϫ[ⲉ] ϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯϫⲟⲩ ⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ ϫ[ⲉ] ⲙⲏ ⲗⲁⲁⲅⲉ ⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲁϩⲟⲩ[ⲛ] ⲁⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲣ̅ⲣⲟ ⲙⲛ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ· ⲉⲉⲓϣⲁⲛ[ⲣ] ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲅⲉⲓ ⲛⲉϥ (2,28–33) He said 'Truly I say to you, no one will ever come into the kingdom of heaven if I command him – ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϫⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲙⲏϩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅· (2,33–34) but because you yourselves are full.	λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ. (14.6) Jesus said to him, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.' αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη. (16.24) Ask and you will receive, so that your joy may be fulfilled. νῦν δὲ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἵνα ἔχωσιν τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. (17.13) But now I am coming to you, and I speak these things in the world so that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves. Cf. ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος· (1.16)

	From his fullness we have all received, grace upon grace.

A major shared theme between John FD and ApJas is the disciples' concern about how to follow Jesus after his final departure. Jesus tells them that he is going home to his Father (John 16.28 corresponds perfectly to ApJas 2,23–25) and that the disciples can accompany him – but conditionally. The Johannine disciples can follow Jesus into the kingdom (or to the Father) when they understand that he is the way (14.6) and that they are connected to the Father through Jesus (14.20). In ApJas, Jesus tells the Twelve that they can only enter the 'kingdom of heaven' if they are 'full' (ⲙⲏⳉ). Perkins conceives this parallel as a difference: 'The issue in the dialogue contrasts entering the kingdom at Jesus' command (impossible) or by "becoming full" (a gnostic)'.[9] However, becoming 'full' in ApJas probably equates to the need for comprehension in John FD. 'Fullness' is not exclusively a 'gnostic' term: In John, it is from Jesus' fullness (πλήρωμα) that humanity has received grace (1.16), and joy can be fulfilled (πεπλήρωται), as John the Baptist discovers when he hears the voice of the bridegroom (3.29). In the FD, Jesus promises the disciples a day when their joy will be fulfilled (πεπληρωμένη) in their asking and receiving (16.24). That day is the day when Jesus no longer speaks in parables (16.25, cf. 17.13) – and thus the disciples will be filled with joy the day they come to understanding.[10] Therefore, instead of the Johannine/gnostic contrast that Perkins imagines, understanding that Jesus is the way to the Father in John is closely related to being filled in ApJas.[11] This is demonstrated through the narrative: in ApJas Jesus takes James and Peter away to 'fill them', but what ensues is a revelatory dialogue from which the receptive disciple will gain understanding.[12]

Throughout the Johannine FD, and in the prayer following, the disciples take on the characteristics of Jesus. They are sent into the world (17.18) to bear witness (15.27), they have received 'the words' that Jesus received (17.8), as well as the glory (17.22) and love (17.26), and they are hated by the world (15.18; 17.16). Come the end of the FD, they can pray directly to the Father (16.23) as Jesus does in chapter 17; and the Father gives 'everything' to Jesus (17.7), which now Jesus gives to the disciples (16.23). Because of Jesus' departure, the disciples are commissioned to do greater works than Jesus himself

---

[9] Perkins, 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas.', 407.
[10] See Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech', 196–97.
[11] This may also be connected with the disciples being 'perfected' (τετελειωμένοι) in unity (17.23).
[12] This will be discussed further below. See also Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech'.

(14.12), leading Woll to envisage the disciples 'as successor-agents of the works of the Son, and as bearers of the presence of Father'.[13]

This role is comparable to the portrayal of the disciples in SophJesChr, in which the relationship between the Father, the Son and the disciples parallels John:

καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον (John 17.18)

As you have sent me into the world, so I have sent them into the world.

ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲩⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓ̈ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩϥ (SophJesChr BG 105,14–17)

You yourselves were sent by the Son who was sent.

Although the relationship of sender and sent corresponds, the contexts are different. In SophJesChr, the disciples are sent by the son to receive light and escape the realm of forgetfulness. This should probably be read alongside 'All who come into the world have been sent by him, like a drop from the light, to the world of the Pantocrator, to guard it through him' (ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩⲥⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓ̈ⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲗ̄ϯⲗⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲓ̈ⲛ ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲉⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓ̈ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ [BG 103,10–26]).[14] The concepts of mission seem very different in the two texts. Yet the texts converge again as the disciples 'who are sent' bear the divine presence (light) in the world but do not belong to it (cf. John 17.16).[15] It seems that the Johannine FD and SophJesChr are grappling with the same idea but approaching it from different perspectives.

In John, the chain of authority also encompasses the Paraclete – the spirit that the Johannine Jesus sends to teach and comfort the disciples, who will only arrive after Jesus' departure. The Paraclete mirrors Jesus – it is sent into the world (17.18) and the world will

---

[13] D. Bruce Woll, 'The Departure of "The Way": The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John', *JBL* 99, no. 2 (1980): 234.

[14] The version in NHC 3 reads ⲭⲉ ⲉⲩⲉϩⲁⲣⲏϩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ (that they may be guarded through him [107,4–5]) instead of ⲉⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ (to guard it through him). The Brill edition translates 'by him' instead of 'through him' and considers the BG version to be corrupt, D. M. Parrott, *Nag Hammadi Codices III,3–4 and V,1, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081: Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ* (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1991), 129. But 'through him' makes better sense as those entering the world protect it from the Pantocrator (the Demiurge) through the agency of the highest god. The two recensions provide different interpretations, with the disciples in BG having an active role in guarding the world.

[15] For this and further parallels to the Johannine concept of sending in ApJohn, ApJas, and other texts, see Johan Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, LNTS 160 (Sheffield: T&T Clark, 1998), 166–200, esp. 183–90.

not receive it (15.18). Martyn argues these actions also apply to the Christian witness.[16] The disciple as a successor of Jesus in a Paraclete-type role is encountered in dialogue gospels, as when James is presented as the 'second teacher' (ⲡⲙⲉϩ ⲥⲁϩ) and 'comfort' (ⲥⲟⲗⲥⲓⲗ) (1ApocJas $_{CT}$ 17,13–15) and Mary stands in for Jesus in GMary.[17] Yet the best example of a disciple becoming Jesus' successor is the question and answer from the disciples to Jesus in GThom 12:

> ⲡⲉⲝⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲓⲥ ⲝⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲝⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ` ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲓⲙ` ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲛⲟϭ ⲉϩⲣⲁ̈ⲓ ⲉⲝⲱⲛ
> ⲡⲉⲝⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲝⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ` ϣⲁ ⲓ̈ⲁⲕⲱⲃⲟⲥ ⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ
> ⲧⲡⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧϥ̄
>
> The disciples said to Jesus, 'We know that you will depart from us. Who will be leader over us?' Jesus said to them, 'Wherever you have come, you shall go to James the Just, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being'.

In 1ApocJas and GMary, succession is implied, but in GThom 12, the concern is explicit and Jesus unequivocally names his replacement as leader. Nowhere in the dialogue gospels does Jesus promise a Johannine-style Paraclete sent from the Father – the disciples must take on this role themselves, becoming Jesus' successors on earth as he abides in heaven.[18]

2.2. Canonical Resurrection Appearances

The four canonical gospels each end with a risen Jesus coming to speak with his disciples, Acts opens with the risen Jesus teaching them about the kingdom of God over the course of forty days (Acts 1.3), and Paul writes of multiple but limited appearances of the risen Lord (1 Cor 15.5–8). This section will select a theme in each of these texts and examine its treatment in the dialogue gospels. A number of other themes might have been selected, such as the nature of ὤφθη in 1 Cor 15.5–8, the journey narrative in Mark LE and Luke 24, or the role of

---

[16] J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, 3rd ed., New Testament Library (Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 141–42.

[17] The Father-Jesus-disciples hierarchy is also explicit in 1ApocJas. See Edwards, 'The Rhetoric of Authority', 65–79. Edwards writes: 'While Jesus is a reflection of the "One Who Is", somehow the same and also second, the same dynamic exists between Jesus and James' (73). He also notes interesting parallels between Jesus' and James' martyrdoms in 1ApocJas, such as James being found not guilty but condemned by a crowd (75). More will be said on Mary's Paraclete-type role in GMary in the next chapter.

[18] But cf. ApJas 11,11–13, 'Woe to you who lack a Paraclete!' (ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲱ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲁⲁⲧ` ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲗⲏⲧⲟⲥ), where the Paraclete is probably the ascended Jesus interceding for his disciples (11,4–6; cf. 1 John 2.1).

the Johannine beloved disciple. The selected themes cannot be confined to individual texts; for example the ambiguous treatment of Jesus' physicality in John 20 is comparable to Luke 24.

2.2.1. *1 Corinthians 15 and the hierarchy of disciples*

In the dialogue gospels, Jesus either speaks with a larger group of disciples (the Twelve [EpPetPhil], the Eleven [EpAp], or the disciples and seven women [SophJesChr]); or a smaller group (DialSav); or a single disciple is the privileged recipient of Jesus' revelation. This presents a hierarchy among the disciples, which relates to the issue of who will be Jesus' successor, discussed above. Top of the hierarchy might be James (1ApocJas, ApJas), Mary (GMary) or Thomas (BookThom).[19] This is predicated on who is the recipient of the revelation of the risen Lord.

Paul raises a similar issue as he lists the disciples to whom Jesus appeared after his resurrection. In 1 Cor 15.5–8 Paul divides the appearances of the risen Jesus into six:

1. And that he appeared to Cephas (καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ)
2. then to the Twelve (εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα)
3. then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers (and sisters) at once, of whom the majority remain until now, but some have fallen asleep (ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν)
4. then he appeared to James (ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ)
5. then to all the apostles (εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν)
6. and last of all, he appeared to me, as to the untimely birth (ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί)

---

[19] There is a fair amount of scholarship on individual disciples that engages with dialogue gospels. A few examples include: Bart D. Ehrman, *Peter, Paul, and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in History and Legend* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Ismo Dunderberg, *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict? Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Although chronology is an issue, Paul's formula places Peter and James in dominant positions, using parallelism in the pairings of 'Cephas – the Twelve' and of 'James – all the apostles' within the format of the εἶτα – ἔπειτα – ἔπειτα – εἶτα construction. So, although Jesus appears to the Twelve before James, Paul's syntax places James' authority above that of the Twelve.

The dialogue gospels are not so concerned with who Jesus appears to *first*. Yet there are clearly dominant and privileged disciples. In BookThom, Jesus speaks to Judas Thomas alone, addressing him as 'my twin and true friend' (ⲡⲁⲥⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲁϣⲃⲣⲙ̅ⲏⲙⲉ [138,7–8]).[20] ApJohn sees John as the chosen disciple and GMary chooses Mary. 1ApocJas describes James as a teacher with his own disciples. EpPetPhil, ApocPet and EpAp see the Twelve (or Eleven) as an apostolic union, but EpPetPhil and ApocPet have Peter leading. EpAp begins with 'John and Thomas and Peter… to the churches' (2.1–3), suggesting John and Thomas have a greater role than Peter.[21] GJudas and ApJas, on the other hand, propose that there is a problem with the apostolic generation. In GJudas, Jesus laughs at the stupidity of the Twelve, and in ApJas, the apostles' salvation is dependent on the generation to come. DialSav has Jesus teaching Matthew, Judas and Mary, and SophJesChr may be the most inclusive of the texts as Jesus appears there to the Twelve and seven women and does not separate any from the rest of the group. Of all the texts discussed, Paul is only included in EpAp, in which Jesus comes to him in a separate appearance: '… and he will hear my voice from heaven with astonishment, fear and trembling' (31.1).

Harnack argued that the lists in 1 Cor 15 came into being from a rivalry between the Peter-party and the James-party in the early Church,[22] and, in view of the dialogue gospels, there may be some truth in this claim. Peter is a contested figure in the dialogue gospels – he is likened to an 'adversary' (ⲁⲛⲧⲓⲕⲉⲓⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ [18,10]) in GMary and so paralleled to the cosmic powers named Desire, Ignorance and Wrath (16,5–13). In EpPetPhil, he is the leader of the

---

[20] Schenke equates this to the beloved disciple in John: 'One is thus justified in supposing a Greek original with this meaning "you are … my true friend" behind the Coptic. Transposed into a form parallel with that of the Gospel of John, this would read "you are the one I truly love," or, in the third person singular, "he is the one whom Jesus truly loved"', Hans-Martin Schenke, 'Function and Background of the Beloved Disciple', in *Der Same Seths: Hans-Martin Schenkes Kleine Schriften zu Gnosis, Koptologie und Neuem Testament*, ed. Gesine Schenke Robinson, Gesa Schenke, and Uwe-Karsten Plisch (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 611.

[21] See Francis Watson, 'A Gospel of the Eleven: The Epistula Apostolorum and the Johannine Tradition', in *Connecting Gospels: Beyond the Canonical/Non-Canonical Divide*, ed. Francis Watson and Sarah Parkhouse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

[22] See Reginald H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980), 28, citing Adolf Harnack, 'Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus (I Kor. 15, 3ff) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Petrus', *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin,* 1922, 62–80.

apostles, writing to Philip to bring him back into the group. Philip willingly goes as requested: 'Philip ultimately is submissive to the will of the apostle Peter… Hence in the *Ep. Pet. Phil.*, as in Acts, the day belongs to Peter. His is the preeminent authority, and the letter and tractate champion his cause'.[23] Also, in EpPetPhil, Peter is the first to receive the Holy Spirit and communicate the Christian message.

In 1ApocJas, there is a stark contrast between James' role and that of the Twelve. James is instructed to 'hide (Jesus' revelation) [wi]thin you and be silent' (ⲉⲕⲉϩⲱⲡ <ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ> ϩⲣ[ⲁⲓ ⲛ̄]ϩⲏⲧⲕ̄· ⲉⲕⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲕⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲕ [ₙₕ꜀ 36,13–14]). The revelation will only be made public several generations later (ₙₕ꜀ 37,20–23). Perkins sees 1ApocJas as

> the most explicit acknowledgement of the non-apostolic character of Gnostic traditions of cosmology, Christology and the ascent of the soul… It was carefully hidden from them [the Twelve], only to be delivered to the Gnostics, who would appear in a later generation.[24]

EpPetPhil and 1ApocJas are striking in how much they emphasize the authority of their protagonists. In both texts, Peter and James are said to have their own 'disciples' (ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ [EpPetPhil ₙₕ꜀ 139,10; 1ApocJas ꜀ₜ 17,11]).[25]

ApJas, conversely, prioritizes James *and* Peter, suggesting that the early Christian split is not quite as stark as a Peter-party and a James-party. However, they are not equals. Peter shows his ignorance in his questions, and James refers to a secret book that contained teachings that the Saviour had revealed to James alone (1,28–35) but states that this one, ApJas, has been revealed to himself and to Peter. But this text too contains teachings that 'the Saviour did not wish to tell all of us, his twelve disciples' (ⲉⲧⲉ·ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲟⲩⲱϣ· [ⲁ]ϫⲟⲟϥ ⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄ ⲡϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲛⲁⲩⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ [1,22–25]). The other disciples are presented as flawed – they write books about the Saviour without being filled (2,8–15, 33–39), and they become jealous of the coming blessed generation (16,2–5).[26]

---

[23] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 96.

[24] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 144.

[25] According to Meyer, it is ambiguous in EpPetPhil whether 'his disciples' refers to Peter speaking to *his disciples* or Peter speaking to *Jesus' disciples*, see Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 150. The former seems more likely. There is a lacuna in the CT version.

[26] For this and also the potentiality of the Twelve writing their gospels before receiving gnosis, see Perkins, 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas.', 404, 406. On the books, see Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James'.

ApJas disparages the apostles and the apostolic age, in which it includes James and Peter alongside the other flawed apostles. This becomes clear on the final pages. James and Peter ascend through the heavens, but cannot reach the highest one: 'We were not permitted to see or hear anything, *for the other disciples called us*' (ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲁⲁⲛ· ⲁⲛⲉⲩ· ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲁⲗⲁⲩⲉ· ϩⲁⲡⲕⲉϣⲱϫⲛ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲣⲁⲛ [15,26–29]). It seems then that James and Peter are constrained by the other disciples; their calling them acts as a reminder that they belong within the limits of the apostolic age. The letter continually looks back and forward; back to the error and ignorance of the apostolic generation and forward to a new generation of children who will secure the salvation of humankind. Jesus pronounces woe on those who have seen the Son of Man, but blessings for those who have not (3,11–23), and points to the future generation:

> ϩⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲙⲛ̄ⲧ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ ⲛⲉ[[ⲉⲓ]] ⲛⲉⲉⲓ ⲛⲧ[ⲁϩⲟⲩ]ⲧⲁϣⲉ ⲁⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡϣⲏ[ⲣⲉ] ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ· ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ ⲉⲣ[ⲉ]ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ (14,41–15,5).
> Three times blessed are they who [were] proclaimed by the So[n] before they came to be, that you might have a portion among them.

And James writes,

> ⲁϥϭⲱⲗⲡ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛ̄ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲛ ⲉⲁϥⲣ̄ ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ [ⲛⲉⲛ] ⲁ[ⲧⲣ]ⲉⲛⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲟⲩ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲛⲁ[ⲩϫ]ⲉ̣[ⲉⲓ] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ (15,38–16,2)
> He revealed to us children who are to come after us, bidding [us] love them, as we would be [saved] because of them.[27]

James then prays that he might obtain a portion among these children (16,9–11) and refers to a faith that will be greater than his. In the text James (and Peter) are not the targets of polemic, but they are certainly understood as belonging to an apostolic age that is inferior to the future generation.

---

[27] The Brill translation reads: '[he] revealed to us children who are to come after us, after bidding [us] love them, as we would be [saved] for their sakes', Francis E. Williams, 'The Apocryphon of James - 1,2: 1.1 - 16:30', in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, NHMS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 53. This translation implies that James and the apostles will be saved in order to help the children, rather than being saved because of their superiority. My translation is similar to Rouleau's, Louise Roy and Donald Rouleau, *L'Épître apocryphe de Jacques (NH I,2) suivi de l'Acte de Pierre (BG 4)*, BCNH:T 18 (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987), 90–91.

Another answer to the question of which disciples Jesus addresses, and one that is omitted by Paul and the texts prioritizing Peter, James or Thomas, is to include women. GMary, SophJesChr, DialSav and EpAp all do so, but in varying ways.[28] GMary presents Mary as lead disciple and privy to previously-unknown eschatological teachings, SophJesChr includes seven women on the mountain with the Twelve, DialSav involves Mary in the dialogue and EpAp has Jesus appearing first to Mary, Martha and Mary Magdalene (or Sarah, Martha and Mary Magdalene in the Ge'ez version).[29] The inclusion of female disciples in a post-resurrection context contrasts with the account in 1 Corinthians, but comes closer to the canonical gospels. The convergence and contrasts between the characters in the dialogue gospels demonstrate how the role of disciples were in flux in the early centuries.

2.2.2. *Matthew 28 and the Mission Charge*

At the end of Matthew, the risen Jesus commissions the Eleven to make disciples of all nations:

> πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. (28.19–20)
>
> Therefore, go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And behold I am with you always, to the very end of the age.

Hartenstein sees Matt 28.16–20 as the most influential of the canonical gospel passages on the dialogue gospels.[30] In Matthew, Jesus' resurrection is accepted without question, unlike Luke or John. Instead of confirming his resurrection, Matthew simply allows Jesus to give his instructions to the disciples – a starting point for many dialogue gospels. Furthermore, the appearance in Matthew is the 'himmlischste' of all the canonical resurrection accounts, with

---

[28] Petersen focuses on the presentation of the women in these texts, Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit!*

[29] The Coptic actually reads 'Mary of Martha (ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲣⲑⲁ) and Mary Magdalene' (9.2) but presumably this is a mistake, as is the preceding reference to 'a th[ird w]oman' (ⲉⲩⲙⲁϩ[ϣⲁⲙⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥ]ϩⲓⲙⲉ); Ge'ez: 'three women'.

[30] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 292.

the mountain setting and no description of Jesus' appearance.[31] The mission charge in Matthew marks a transition point from the teaching of Jesus to the activity of the disciples, which has inspired GMary, EpAp, ApocPet and SophJesChr.[32]

Hartenstein argues that SophJesChr is an extension or alternative to the Matthean commission scene. SophJesChr begins by stating that Jesus rose from the dead and appeared to his twelve disciples and seven women on a mountain in Galilee ($_{BG}$ 77,8–78,15), which is the same setting as Matt 28.16–20. Hartenstein also suggests that the perplexity of the disciples before Jesus in SophJesChr ($_{BG}$ 78,2) may parallel the doubt of Matt 28.17. Furthermore, at the end of SophJesChr, Jesus declares that he has given the disciples authority over all things ($_{BG}$ 126,12–14), which may be a continuation of Matt 28.18, and the invitation to awaken his people ($_{BG}$ 126,11–12) reinterprets the commission of Matt 28.19.[33] Helmer sees parallels between Matt 28.16–20 and the beginning of ApocPet, as it is set on a mountain, where the disciples approach and worship Jesus, and are told to increase the number of believers (1.2–3).[34]

The command to preach is prevalent in dialogue gospels, either explicitly or implicitly. From Matt 28.19–20, what the disciples are supposed to do is clear; how they are supposed to do it is not. In Matthew, there is no evidence that Jesus has provided the capability, knowledge or means to enact his instruction. While in Luke-Acts and John he equips them with the Spirit, in Matthew there are just the relatively impractical words: 'I am with you always'. In the dialogue gospels, the lack of training and education leads to mission anxiety. Thomas in BookThom and the Eleven in EpAp worry about not having enough information – how can they make disciples if they do not fully understand the Christian message themselves?

ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ [ⲁⲛ] ⲡⲁϫⲉⲛ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲉ ⲡϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲁⲧⲛ̄ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ ·
ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϫⲉ ⲕⲟⲩⲁϩⲥⲁϩⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲁⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲁⲉⲓϣ · ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲁⲛⲛⲁⲙ̄ⲙⲉ ϩⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ
[ⲁ]ⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ ⲁⲟⲩ ⲧⲛ̄ϩⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲧⲁϣⲉⲁⲉⲓϣ ⲉϥⲣ̄ϣⲉⲩ ⲁⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛⲉ
ⲥⲉϩⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲣⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲓ̈ ⲧⲁⲣⲛ̄ϣⲛ̄ⲧⲕ ⲛ̄ϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ (EpAp 23.1–3)

---

[31] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 293–94.
[32] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 297. She writes of SophJesChr, ApocJas and GMary that they are '[b]esonders stark matthäisch geprägt' (292).
[33] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 57–58. On this last point on Matthean call to mission and awakening in SophJesChr, see also Falkenberg, 'Matthew 28:16–20 and the Nag Hammadi Library', 93–104.
[34] Helmer, 'That We May Know and Understand', 67.

Again, we said to him, 'Lord, it is necessary for us to question you, for you command us to preach; so that we ourselves may know with certainty through you and be useful preachers, and [that] those who will teach through us may believe in you. That is why we question you so much!'

ⲡⲁϫⲉⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉϥ [ϫⲉ ⲡϫⲁ]ⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ̣ⲛ ⲏ [ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧ]ⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲣⲁⲛ (EpAp 30.1)

We said to him: '[Lo]rd, who will believe us, or [who] will listen to us?'

ⲡⲁϫⲉϥ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲑⲱⲙⲁⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ϭⲉ ϯⲥⲟⲡⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲱ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ [ⲛ̄ⲛ]ⲉϯϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ` ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ` ϩⲁ ⲑⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕ ` ⲁⲛⲁⲗⲏⲙ`ⲯⲓⲥ [ⲁⲩ]ⲱ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ` ⲉⲉⲓϣⲁⲛ`ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ ` ϩⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ` ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ϭⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲉⲓ ⲉϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏ`ⲧ[ⲟ]ⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲏⲉ ⲥⲙⲟⲕϩ ⲁ`ⲁ[ⲥ] ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ` (BookThom 138,21–27)

Now Thomas said to the Lord, 'Therefore I beg you to tell me what I ask you before your ascension, and when I hear from you about the hidden things, then I can speak about them. And it is obvious to me that the truth is difficult to perform before men'.

ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲓϣⲁ[ϫⲉ ⲉ]ⲧⲕϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛ ϩⲉⲛⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥ[ⲙⲟ]ⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲛ̄ⲁ̄ⲕ ϣⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ⲥⲉⲥⲟ[ⲟⲩ]ⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲁϣ ϭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲁϣⲃⲱⲕ ⲁ[ⲧⲁ]ϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ϫⲉ ⲥⲉϣⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ [ⲁⲛ ϩ]ⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ (BookThom 142,21–26)

But these words that you speak to us are ridiculous and contemptible to the world since they are misunderstood. So how can we go and preach them since we are [not] esteemed [in] the world?

While these two texts otherwise have drastically different priorities – the former focusing on the fleshly nature of the resurrection and the latter on an ascetic message of contempt for the flesh – they converge at the point of the disciples' concern about mission. The Jesus of EpAp relieves the disciples' trepidation, assuring them that he will give them his peace and spirit and that they will prophesy (30.2). In BookThom, Jesus' responds to Thomas' concerns by saying that those who sneer or smirk at the Christian message will go to hell (142,24–37).

A comparable mission anxiety is articulated in GMary and EpPetPhil, where the anxiety stems from fear of persecution rather than fear of ridicule. Jesus has commanded the disciples to preach, and the disciples appreciate that this might lead to their suffering:

73

ⲁⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϣⲁ ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ϣⲁ ⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ

ⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲧⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ

ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲧⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ (GMary 9,6–12)

They wept much, saying, 'How shall we go to the nations and preach the gospel of the kingdom of the Son of Man? If they did not spare him, how will they spare us?' (9,6–12).

ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉ[ⲓⲥ] ⲁϥϫⲓ ⲙⲕⲁϩ ϩⲓⲉ ⲁⲟⲩⲏⲣ ϭⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ (EpPetPhil _{NHC} 138,15–16)

If he, our Lor[d], suffered, then how much (must) we (suffer)?

In both texts, the concern is voiced as the disciples speak with each other about Jesus' words after he has departed. In Jesus' final instructions, he had told them to preach. Following this, Jesus reappears to confirm that they must suffer in EpPetPhil, and Mary comforts her brothers by reminding them that Jesus will protect them in GMary. Their fears must be allayed as the narratives conclude with the disciples going out to preach.

The support promised to the disciples in their anxiety differs in these two gospels. In GMary, Mary acts as a comforter to remind them that Jesus will protect them. The disciples are instructed to find the Son of Man within and put on the Perfect Man (8,18–20; 18,16), and so being armed with Christ they can preach the gospel. In EpPetPhil, they receive the Holy Spirit (_{NHC} 140,1–13). In its christological focus and in Mary's assurance that 'his grace will be with you all' (ⲧⲉϥⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̣ [9,16–17]), GMary comes close to the Matthean 'I am with you always' (Matt 28.20), but GMary uses the Pauline language of 'putting on' (Rom 13.14; Gal 3.27) and 'Perfect Man' (Col 1.28; Eph 4.13) to express this point. EpPetPhil combines repeated allusions to Matt 28.20 (134,17–18; 138,1–3; 140,22–22) with unmistakable echoes of Acts 2, as the exalted Lord bestows the Spirit on Peter and the other disciples to empower them for mission (139,14; 140,5–10).

The Matthean commission is about more than just making disciples, it is about going to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. EpPetPhil, EpAp, PistSoph, GMary and ApocPet advocate a worldwide mission. In ApocPet, Peter commands Jesus to 'send my message into the whole world in peace' (14.5). As we have seen, in GMary the disciples worry about preaching to the ϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ. In PistSoph, Jesus says, 'when I have gone to the light, preach to the whole world' (ⲉⲓϣⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲕⲏⲣⲩⲥⲥⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣϥ̄ [3.102 (256,2–3)]) and the text closes with the

disciples going out in threes to preach the gospel in the four directions (4.148).[35] Likewise, the disciples of EpAp are commissioned to preach to the East, West, North and South (30.1). And in EpPetPhil, it is said that the disciples went 'out in four words' (ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲡⲓϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ϣⲁϫⲉ [140,25]). Meyer questions whether this could be amended to four directions, but also proposes that we could read in it Irenaeus' conception of four directions corresponding to four gospels (*Adv. Haer.* 3.11.8).[36]

In these cases, the dialogue gospels go beyond the Matthean narrative by narrating the disciples' reactions to the charge and overcoming their anxieties. In none of these cases do they assume that the Eleven on the mountain in Galilee were thrilled by Jesus' instruction to make disciples of all nations. Rather, they appreciate that the disciples might have some concerns.

2.2.3. *Mark LE and the description: 'In Another Form'*

Mark has four different endings in the MS tradition. 16.9–20 (the 'longer ending') is not in the earliest manuscripts and Eusebius' *ad Marinum* tells us that the 'accurate copies' (τὰ ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων) do not include it.[37] The 'accurate' text concludes at 16.8 with the women fleeing from the tomb, for 'terror and amazement had seized them and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid' (εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ). The 'shorter ending' follows from verse 8, and states that the women did report what they had been told to Peter and his companions, and that after this Jesus himself sent out the proclamation of eternal salvation through the disciples. (The fourth ending, the 'Freer Logion', will be briefly discussed in the next section.) The 'longer ending' (LE) adds Jesus' appearances to Mary Magdalene, to two disciples walking in the country, and to the Eleven. Never in the dialogue gospels do the male or female disciples stay silent from fear, but numerous connections with Mark LE can be found.

When Jesus appears to the two disciples walking in the country, the post-Markan author-editor writes that he manifests himself 'in another form' (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ [16.12]). This idea that the risen Jesus differs from his pre-crucifixion self is reflected in the

---

[35] This conclusion is a later addition.
[36] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 160.
[37] See James A. Kelhoffer, 'The Witness of Eusebius's ad Marinum and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates Concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark's Gospel', in his *Conceptions of 'Gospel' and Legitimacy in Early Christianity*, WUNT 324 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 121–64.

resurrection scene of Luke (vanishing from sight) and John (appearing through locked doors); it is also anticipated in the transfiguration accounts. Matthew has nothing to suggest an unfamiliar form, unless it is implied by his reference to the disciples' doubt (Matt 28.17). The question is whether the deutero-Markan 'other form' serves to *disguise* his true identity, as the parallel with Luke's Emmaus road story might suggest (cf. Luke 24.15–16), or whether, on the contrary, it serves to *reveal* it – as in the transfiguration story, where Jesus' trans-formation (μετεμορφώθη, Mark 9.2) involves an appearance 'in another form' (cf. 16.12) that makes him recognizable as who he truly is. In spite of the apparent link to Luke's story of an unrecognized Jesus accompanying two disciples as they walk into the country, the point in Mark 16.12 is that he *was* recognized – it was precisely in that 'other form' that he was 'manifested' (ἐφανερώθη).[38]

It is common for dialogue gospels to begin with an appearance of Jesus in a different form, and this form is often characterised by its luminosity.[39] SophJesChr and PistSoph emphasize light in the appearance of Christ, making him hyper-recognizable as the risen Saviour. SophJesChr begins: 'The Saviour appeared to them not in his previous form but in the invisible spirit, and his likeness resembled *a great angel of light*' (ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϥϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ ⲁ̄ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲁϩⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ [BG 78,11–79,2]). According to PistSoph,

ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϫ̄ⲡ̄ϥ̄ⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲣⲁⲥⲧⲉ ⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ⲉϥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ'· ⲉϥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲙⲁϣⲟ ⲉⲙⲁϣⲟ · ⲉⲙⲛ̄·ϣⲓ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲓ̈ⲛ ⲉⲧϥ̄ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ · ⲛⲉϥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲙ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ · ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲙⲛ̄ϣ̄ϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲣⲙ̄ⲛⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛϥ̄ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ · ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉϥⲛⲉϫⲁⲕⲧⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ϣⲓ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲁⲕⲧⲓⲛ · ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲉϥϣⲏϣ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲉⲣⲏⲩ · ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲉϥⲟ' ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲡⲉ ... (PistSoph 1.4 [7,6–14])

[38] It is usually assumed that Mark LE is just a summary of canonical appearance stories, including Luke's Emmaus road account. Foster writes: 'The so-called "longer ending" cobbles together a number of post-resurrection scenes from both canonical and non-canonical sources, including a much abbreviated parallel to Luke 24:13–35', Paul Foster, 'Polymorphic Christology: Its Origins and Development in Early Christianity', *JTS* 58, no. 1 (2007): 70.

[39] See Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 49–52. Fallon sees the light-form epiphany as typical: 'The epiphany of the revealer is presented. It is frequently but not always associated with light, involved with a self-predication, and placed upon a mountain', Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 125. As well as SophJesChr and PistSoph, EpPetPhil has Jesus as a light and voice. Also, although BookThom does not have an appearance narrative, the resurrected Saviour reveals himself to be 'the light that is about to withdraw back to the heavenly essence of light. As the light, he serves to illumine the secrets of darkness', John D. Turner, *The Book of Thomas the Contender from Codex II of the Cairo Gnostic Library from Nag Hammadi (CG II, 7): The Coptic Text with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, SBLDS 23 (Missoula, MT: SBL Scholars Press, 1975), 4–5.

On the ninth hour of the following day the heavens opened, and they saw Jesus coming down, giving light exceedingly, and there was no measure to the light in which he was. For he gave more light than in the hour that he went up to heaven, so that the people of the world were not able to speak of the light which was his, and he cast forth very many rays of light, and there was no measure to his rays. And his light was not equal throughout, but it was of different kinds …

The description continues with different types of light. Chapter seven explains Jesus' garment of light – he received it after his crucifixion, and now he has received it, he will reveal the truth to humanity (1.7 [9,22–10,17]).[40] The form of great light is connected both with the resurrected Christ and his role as revealer. There is likely to be a Johannine element here, as Jesus is the light in the darkness (John 8.12, 9.5, 12.46), but the form of the risen Christ as light is also connected to Mark LE as the three appearances of Jesus use the verb φαίνω (16.9, 12, 14), which has luminosity connotations.

Another striking example of a ἑτέρα μορφή is the polymorphous Christ of ApJohn:

ⲁ[ϊⲣ ϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲓ̈]ⲛⲁⲩ ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ̇ⲛ [ⲉⲩⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲁϩⲉ ⲇⲉ] ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲛⲁ[ⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡ]ⲉ̣ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁϥⲕⲱ[ⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉ]ϥⲥⲙⲁⲧ ˋ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩϩⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲩ[ⲟ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲁⲛ ⲙ]ⲡⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲛˋ ⲟ[ⲩⲉⲓ]ⲛ̣ⲉ ⲉ̣[ϥⲟ ⲛ]ϩⲁϩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟ̇[ⲉⲓⲛ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̣[ⲓⲥⲙⲁⲧ] ˋ ⲛⲁⲩⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲁ[ⲩⲱ] ⲡⲉ̣[ⲥⲙⲁ]ⲧˋ ⲛⲁϥⲟ ⲛ̄ϣⲟ[ⲙ]ⲧ̣[ⲉ] ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ (NHC2 2,1–9)

[I was …. afraid and behold, I] saw in the lig[ht a child, and he stoo]d by me. While I loo[ked at him, he became] like an old man. And he tur[ned] his form, becoming like a servant. There [was not a plurality] before me and there was a [like]ness [with] many forms in the light and th[e forms] appeared through each other a[nd] the [for]m has thr[e]e forms.[41]

---

[40] Robinson suggests that the risen Jesus appeared in a luminous form in the earliest resurrection accounts, James M. Robinson, 'Jesus from Easter to Valentinus (Or to the Apostles' Creed)', *JBL* 101, no. 1 (1982): esp. 11–14.
[41] The BG version is slightly different. It begins with a child (ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲟⲩ) and the old man (ϩⲗ̄ⲗⲟ) (BG 21,4–5). The text reads that it had three faces (ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲙ ˋⲧˊ ⲛ̄ϩⲟ) [BG 21,13]) but there is no servant as in NHC2.

Foster argues that polymorphic appearances often occur in post-resurrection contexts as 'they were a way of communicating Jesus' transcendence over the realm of death'.[42] However, different appearances of Jesus are not limited to his resurrected body – as in the transfiguration scene, where Jesus is manifest in his true glory (Matt 17.1–8 + pars.), and GJudas. Set before the crucifixion, GJudas tells how 'a number of times he did not reveal himself to his disciples, but could be found as a child[43] in their midst' (ⲟⲩⲏⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ [ⲛ]ⲥⲟⲡ' ⲙⲁϥⲟⲩⲟⲛⲋϥ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲋ̄ⲣⲟⲧ ϣⲁ{ⲕ}<ⲩ>ⲋ̄ⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲋⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲏⲧⲉ [33,18–21]). Appearing as a child in GJudas seems to have the opposite purpose to the transfiguration narratives and to the appearance accounts in SophJesChr and ApJohn: rather than showing his glory, he is hiding himself. ⲙⲁϥⲟⲩⲟⲛⲋϥ̄ suggests concealment.

The tradition of Christ appearing in a different and often luminous form reflects early Christian concerns over christology and resurrection. Each time that a text includes a description of the form of Jesus, it is attempting to answer questions about who Jesus is, and possibly also about the resurrection of humanity. SophJesChr, PistSoph and ApJohn are grappling with the same question as Mark 16.12, the question how Jesus appeared after his resurrection. SophJesChr and PistSoph converge with Mark 16.12 especially if (deutero-)Mark too implies a luminous or radiant form, as at the transfiguration. However, in these texts Jesus appears to retain his bodily identity. ApJohn takes a different approach, completely freeing the risen Jesus from the confines of the (un-morphable) flesh.

---

[42] Foster, 'Polymorphic Christology', 67. In ApJohn, however, the reason for the three forms is unclear. Pleše proposes that it was read in various ways: 'For some, multiformity has more to do with different spiritual capacities of recipients than with Christ's real nature. For others, it proved that Christ was, in fact, without any form and above all determinations. For some, again, polymorphy was the visible expression of Christ's multiple potencies, virtues, or perfections (ἐπίνοιαι), in contrast with the unity, simplicity, and ineffability of the transcendent Father. For others, it was the symbol of Christ's paradoxical status, of his being one with and, at the same time, different from the other members of the divine triad', Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 32–33.

[43] The meaning of ⲛ̄ⲋ̄ⲣⲟⲧ is unclear. It may be a form of the word 'child' in the Bohairic or Old Coptic dialect, or ⲋⲟⲣⲧϥ̄ or ⲋⲟⲣⲧ 'apparition' or 'phantom'. Jenott argues that 'child' is the most plausible translation due to fluctuation between Coptic dialects, and the tradition of Jesus appearing as a child (e.g. ApJohn), Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas*, 189–90.

2.2.4. *The Freer Logion*

The fourth variation in the MS tradition of the ending of Mark is found in the fourth- or fifth-century Codex Washingtonianus, which inserts a dialogue known as the 'Freer Logion' into the Longer Ending.[44]

κἀκεῖνοι ἀπελόγουντε λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος τῆς ἀνομίας καὶ τῆς ἀπιστίας ὑπὸ τὸν σατανᾶν ἔστιν ὁ μή ἐῶν τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πν[ευμ]άτων ἀκάθαρτα τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θ[εο]ῦ καταλάβεσθαι δύναμιν διὰ τοῦτο ἀποκάλυψόν σου τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἤδη ἐκεῖνοι ἔλεγον τῷ χ[ριστ]ῷ καὶ ὁ χ[ριστὸ]ς ἐκείνοις προσέλεγεν ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ ὅρος τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς εξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἀλλά ἐγγίζει ἄλλα δινὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐγὼ ἁμαρτησάντων παρεδόθη(ν) εἰς θάνατον ἵνα ὑποστρέψωσιν εἰς τὴ(ν) ἀλήθειαν καὶ μηκέτι ἁμαρτήσωσιν ἵνα τὴν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πν[ευματ]ικὴν καὶ ἄφθαρτον τῆς δικαιοσύηνς δόξαν κληρονομήσωσιν.[45]

And they began defending themselves and said, 'This lawless and unbelieving age is under Satan, the one who does not permit the things made unclean by the spirits to receive powerfully the truth of God. Because of this reveal your righteousness now!' They kept on saying this to Christ and Christ began to respond to them, 'The limit of the years of the authority of Satan is fulfilled, but other fearful things draw near and for the sake of those who sinned I was handed over to death, in order that they may return to the truth and no longer sin, in order that they may inherit the spiritual and imperishable glory of righteousness in heaven.'

This passage is inserted between the references to Jesus rebuking the disciples for their lack of faith (16.14) and telling them to preach the gospel to all creation (16.15).

The Freer Logion has been included in lists of post-resurrection dialogue gospels in the *NT Apocrypha*, as seen in the last chapter. Hartenstein sees it as different from the others, as 'nur das Freer-Logion zeigt keinerlei Beziehung zu gnostichen Gedanken'.[46] Bockmuehl

---

[44] Frey thinks that this might have been inserted in the latter half of the second century, as an edifying expansion of Mark LE, Jörg Frey, 'Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion', *ZNW* 93, no. 1–2 (2002): 13–34.

[45] Greek and translation (adapted) from Thomas R. Shepherd, 'Narrative Analysis as a Text Critical Tool: Mark 16 in Codex W as a Test Case', *JSNT* 32, no. 1 (2009): 84. Nomina sacra taken from Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 82.

[46] Hartenstein, 'Dialogische Evangelien', 1052.

notes that it cannot be seen as a dialogue gospel because it never existed independently of Mark.[47]

The Freer Logion is important in many ways – although it may be the work of a single scribe,[48] it tells us that post-resurrection narratives were being edited and expanded; that early Christians thought it was appropriate for the risen Jesus to engage in dialogue with his disciples; and that the disciples wanted answers from him. Also, it blurs the divide between canonical and 'apocryphal' resurrection dialogues by showing that the former could be amended and elaborated.

2.2.5. *Luke 24 and the Hidden Sense of Scripture*

In Luke, Jesus' first appearance is to Cleopas and his unnamed companion on the road to Emmaus. Jesus 'comes near' (ἐγγίσας [24.15]) 'but their eyes were kept from recognizing him' (οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν [v.16]). After a short dialogue and recognition through bread-breaking, Jesus then vanishes from their sight: αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν (v.31). This suggests that he is not in the same, recognizable, bodily form that he was before his death.

It is within this Lukan narrative that we find one of the themes of the dialogue gospels: the revelation of the previously-concealed meaning of scripture, which then becomes a key for understanding the significance of Jesus himself. In the dialogue between Jesus and the two travellers (24.14–15, 17–21, 25–27), Jesus reveals the scriptural testimony to the Messiah's death and resurrection, which is repeated in his later appearance in Jerusalem:

> καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. (24.27)
> Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures.

> τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς (24.45)
> Then he opened their mind to understand the scriptures.

---

[47] Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, 162–63.
[48] Jörg Frey, 'Das Freer-Logion', in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Band in zwei Teilbänden: Evangelien und Verwandtes.*, ed. Christoph Markschies and Jens Schröter, vol. 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 1060.

Luke is the only canonical gospel in which the risen Jesus explicitly reveals what has been concealed from the disciples. Their previous ignorance of the true meaning of scripture is closely related to their failure to recognize Jesus himself. Indeed, his identity is *concealed* from the disciples: 24.16 tells us that their eyes 'were being held so as not to recognize him' (ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν). This concealment is also emphasized in Luke's version of the second and third passion predictions:

> θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους· ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἴσθωνται αὐτό, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου. (9.44–45)
>
> 'Let these words sink into your ears: The Son of Man is going to be betrayed into human hands.' But they did not understand this saying; its meaning was *concealed* from them, so that they could not perceive it. And they were afraid to ask him about this saying.

> καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα. (18.34)
>
> But they understood nothing about all these things; in fact, what he said was *hidden* from them, and they did not grasp what was said.

In Luke, even the most astute disciple could not have understood Jesus' predictions about his death and resurrection. In each case, the concealment is an action from God.[49] Luke's concept of 'once hidden/now revealed' corresponds to a ministry/post-resurrection chronological setting. A similar schema occurs in Matthew and Mark, where it is said that the revelation of Jesus' identity at the transfiguration is to be kept secret until after the resurrection (Mark 9.9 // Matt 17.9).[50] It is the post-resurrection setting that is the moment for full disclosure.

---

[49] Tannehill notes that Luke 24 'emphatically repeats themes which have already been expressed in the passion prophecies of Jesus', Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation; Volume 1, The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986), 277. Also, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*, ABC 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1563.

[50] Luke omits the passage in which the disciples descend from the mountain in Mark 9.9–13.

This idea is prevalent in dialogue gospels. In EpAp, the disciples explicitly comment on the fact that hidden things are revealed only after Jesus' resurrection:

Lord, what great things you have spoken to us and revealed to us, things never yet spoken, and in everything you have comforted us and been gracious to us! For after your resurrection you revealed all this to us, so that we might truly be saved. (34.1–2)

In Luke, we are not told what scriptures Jesus explains and what he says. Morris suggests that 'Jesus began a systematic Bible study… [Luke] makes it clear that the whole Old Testament was involved'.[51] In reality, this is not remotely clear but the Lukan Jesus presumably does explain a range of Old Testament passages. ApJohn has the risen Lord doing exactly that, narrating the risen Christ explaining and interpreting the early history of humankind as found in Gen 1–7 from the beginning to the flood, as the context for his own role as Saviour.[52] In spite of the major ideological differences between Luke and ApJohn, both writers agree that a correct interpretation of scripture is a prerequisite for understanding the coming of Jesus.

In ApJohn the links to Genesis are more than just a re-telling of the story: there are direct links to the text of LXX Genesis. Following Yaldabaoth's boast that there is no god beside him, a voice comes from above saying: 'The Man exists and the Son of Man' (ϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ [BG 47,14–16]). As King notes,

This statement is almost a direct quotation from the Greek translation of *Genesis* 1.3, in which God says (in Hebrew), '"Let there be light" and there was light.' The Hebrew term for light is translated into Greek as *phos*, which spells two Greek words depending upon how they are accented, either φῶς ("light") or φώς ("human"). Since most ancient manuscripts are not accented, the Greek could be translated either as 'Let there be light and there was light' or 'Let the human exist and the human exists.' The *Secret Revelation of John* exploits this ambiguity in order to make a pun

---

[51] Leon Morris, *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1988), 370. Tannehill, more sensibly, writes that Luke's 'sweeping language seems to point beyond a limited number of scriptural predictions to something that is central to Scripture as such', Tannehill, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 286.

[52] Pleše concurs: 'Christ's hermeneutical strategy, as described in Luke [24.27], is therefore not much different from the Savior's exegesis of *Genesis* [in ApJohn]', Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 17. On Genesis in ApJohn, see Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, NHMS 58 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006).

identifying the image of the First Human who appears in the waters below with the primordial light of *Genesis* 1.3.[53]

As ApJohn retells the Genesis story, Christ explains to John that Moses' interpretation was wrong: 'it is not as Moses said' (ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲱ̈ⲩⲥⲏⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲝⲟⲟⲥ [ᵦᴳ 58,16–17, cf. also 45,8–10; 73,4–5]). As Pleše writes, '[t]he Savior's hermeneutical stance is polemical and revisionary. What he contests is not the facticity of events recorded by Moses, but the perspective from which they are told – that is, the authority of Moses as a reliable witness and narrator'.[54] In spite of this explicit undermining of Moses, however, the Jesus of ApJohn is still concerned to reveal the true meaning concealed behind the text of Genesis.

Correct interpretation of Moses within a post-resurrection setting also features in PistSoph, although here the concern is not with prophecy (as in Luke) or the primeval narrative (as in ApJohn) but with the commandments of the law. These need to be interpreted correctly, and in light of Jesus' teachings.[55] In the course of a long discourse about fate and the archons, the Saviour says:

> ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ϭⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲓ̈ⲝⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲱ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲟⲓ̈ϣ ⲝⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲛⲁⲕⲁ ⲉⲓⲱⲧ' ⲁⲛ ϩⲓ ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ
> ⲛ̄ϥⲉⲓ' ⲛ̄ϥⲟⲩⲁϩ̄ϥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲓ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ϥⲙ̄ⲡϣⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ · ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲝⲟⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲝⲉ
> ⲉⲧⲉⲧ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ · ⲧⲁⲣ̄ⲧⲏⲩ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ
> ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ (1.131 [337,18–25])
>
> Now concerning this, I have said to you once: 'The one who does not leave father and mother and come and follow me is not worthy of me'. Now I said at that time: 'You should leave your fathers, the archons, so that I make you sons of the First Mystery for ever'.

Here Jesus cites one of his own sayings, in a form influenced by Gen 2.24: 'The one who does not leave (καταλείψει)...' rather than 'the one who loves (φιλῶν) father and mother more than me...' (Matt 10.37), or 'the one who does not hate (οὐ μισεῖ) his father and

---

[53] King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, 98. Greek characters inserted.
[54] Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 67. Recently, Creech has argued that the challenges to Moses were inserted later and in reaction to conflict with the 'orthodox' church, David Creech, *The Use of Scripture in the Apocryphon of John: A Diachronic Analysis of the Variant Versions*, WUNT II 441 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).
[55] PistSoph also makes reference to other Old Testament material, such as several psalms (1.32–2.82) as well as discussing the afterlife of the prophets and patriarchs (3.135).

mother…' (Luke 14.26). An apparent contradiction of the law of Moses causes confusion for Salome, who asks:

> ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲉⲓⲉ ⲡⲱⲥ ⲥⲏϩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲙⲙⲱⲩ̈ⲥⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲕⲱ
> ⲛⲥⲱϥ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲛ ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲙⲟⲩ · ⲉⲓⲉ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ϣⲁϫⲉ
> ⲁⲛ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ (3.132 [338,2–6])
>
> My Lord, if our fathers are the archons, how is it written in the law of Moses: 'He who shall leave his father and his mother shall die the death.' Did the law not therefore speak of it?

Mary Magdalene asks Jesus if she can respond, and it is she who offers the correct interpretation of Moses' commandment:

> ⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲙⲓⲙⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲁ ·
> ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ · ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ · ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲧⲁ
> ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲉⲓ' ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲟⲛⲣⲙⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲉⲛϩⲟⲩⲛ
> ⲙⲡⲟⲟⲩ · ⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲟⲛ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϭⲱ ⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲙⲛ
> ⲛⲉϥⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲉϥⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ · ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ϥⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ · ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ
> ϥⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ (3.132 [338,20–339,4])
>
> The law has not said this concerning the soul, nor concerning the body, nor concerning the spirit counterpart, for all these are sons of the archons and come from them, but the law has said this concerning the power which came forth from the Saviour, which is the man of light within us today. The law has thus said: 'Everyone who will remain outside the Saviour and his mysteries, all his fathers, not only will he die the death, but he will be destroyed with destruction'.

The passage from the law that Salome quotes and Mary interprets is based on Exod 21.16 LXX, also cited in Mark and Matthew: 'For Moses said: "Honour your father and your mother," and, "The one who speaks evil of father or mother must surely die"' (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν, Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καί, Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω [Mark 7.10; cf. Matt 15.4]). True interpretation of scripture – here carried out by a disciple – is assigned to a post-resurrection setting.

Although otherwise dissimilar, Luke 24, ApJohn and PistSoph all present the risen Christ as giving or enabling an interpretation of scripture in the light of his own coming. Luke sets the precedent here. The three texts employ a two-era schema of concealment and revelation: before Jesus the true meaning of Moses' words was hidden, and only after the resurrection is their true meaning revealed.

2.2.6. *Acts 1 and the Ascension*

Luke's ending parallels Acts' beginning: the risen Christ teaches and ascends. Luke's narration of the ascension differs from the disappearance at Emmaus and indicates that his departure is final. The beginning of Acts tells us that Jesus appeared over a period of forty days, with convincing proofs and teaching about the Kingdom of God (1.3). The ascension is again narrated but differently to Luke, with more emphasis on a visible event:

> καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Luke 24.51)
> While he was blessing them, he withdrew from them and was carried up into heaven.

> καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη, καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πορευομένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς, οἳ καὶ εἶπαν, Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, τί ἑστήκατε [ἐμ]βλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὃν τρόπον ἐθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. (Acts 1.9–11)
> When he had said this, as they were watching, he was lifted up, and a cloud took him out of their sight. While he was going and they were gazing up toward heaven, suddenly two men in white robes stood by them. They said, 'Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up toward heaven? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven'.

Jesus' final departure in dialogue gospels is told in different ways. Some are closer to the vanishing at Emmaus, others are more like the Acts account of a visible ascension. GMary (9,5) and ApJas (15,6) simply have ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ (he departed). In the case of GMary,

commentators have wondered whether this terse statement necessarily implies a final departure,[56] but the anguish and conflict following Jesus' departure indicate that this is the case. In ApJas, ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ clearly implies an ascension, as Jesus has previously referred to it (14,20–21), and James and Peter follow him up through the heavens, where they encounter apocalyptic images of wars, trumpets and angelic jubilation.

GJudas uses the same expression, ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ (44,14), but for a temporary departure. 'He departed' ends the line in the codex, followed by a blank space equivalent to about five letters, but the next line begins with Judas asking Jesus a question. It is a clear but not a climactic departure. The ascension in GJudas is also conceived differently, as it occurs before the crucifixion. The text reads:

ⲓ̈ⲟⲩⲇⲁⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲁϥϥⲓⲁⲧ̅ϥ̅ ⲉⲍ̅ⲣⲁⲉⲓ ⲁϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧϭⲏⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϥⲱⲕ ⲉⲍ̅ⲟ̅ⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ (57,22–24)
Judas raised his eyes, he saw the luminous cloud, and he entered it.

A voice comes from the cloud, followed by five lines of lacunae (all we can decipher of the voice's message is a possible reference to the great race), and then the words: 'Then Judas stopped looking [at J]esus' (ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓ̈ⲟⲩⲇⲁⲥ ⲗⲟ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ [ⲉⲓ̈]ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ [58,5–6]). It is unclear who has ascended. Schenke Robinson argues that the ⲁⲩⲱ allows Jesus to be the subject of ⲁϥϥⲱⲕ, and so the scene depicts Jesus' spiritual self entering the cloud, leaving his body behind to be crucified.[57] Jenott leans more towards Judas entering the cloud, but also disagrees that the text narrates a final departure of Jesus at all: '[I]t may simply indicate the end of the vision'.[58] According to Jenott, the scene is close to Moses' entering a cloud on Mount Sinai (Exod 24.18–25.1) or to the Lukan transfiguration scene (Luke 9.34–35) due to the revelatory voice.[59] Both Judas and Jesus are on earth after the voice speaks. However, as Jesus' ascension is assumed throughout early Christian literature, GJudas may well also imply ascension of some kind.

EpPetPhil also has Jesus (in the form of light) ascending, but then reappearing. The ascension seems to be final:

---

[56] Hartenstein notes that it could refer to a mundane departure, a miraculous vanishing or an ascension, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 145. Tuckett sees a final parting, Tuckett, *Mary*, 161.
[57] Gesine Schenke Robinson, 'The Relationship of the Gospel of Judas to the New Testament and to Sethianism', *Journal of Coptic Studies* 10 (2008): 65–68.
[58] Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas*, 17.
[59] Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas*, 17.

[т]отє асϣωпє ΝϬι ογεврнϬес мΝ ογϩρογмпє εвολ ϩΝ тпє· αγω αγτωрп̄ мпєтαϥογωΝϩ Ναγ εвολ мпιμα єτμμαγ єϩραϊ єтпє· (138,3–7)

Then there came lightning and thunder from heaven, and what appeared to them there was taken up to heaven.

However, 'what appeared to them there' refers to the Lord in the form of a voice in a light rather than a bodily Jesus.[60] Furthermore, this ascension imagery does not presuppose finality. Jesus speaks on two further occasions, firstly just as a voice (138,21) but then in a further appearance when the disciples have come together again after going out to preach: 'Jesus appeared to them' (αϥογωΝϩ εвολ ΝϬι ῑс̄ [140,16]) with the peace greeting familiar from bodily appearances elsewhere. EpPetPhil shows that dialogue gospels can have a flexible understanding of ascension, and so it is quite possible that in GJudas Jesus ascends (in some sense) even before his crucifixion.

EpAp leaves absolutely no ambiguity in its cinematic narration that makes the ascension an observable, historical event. The final pages of the text have not survived in the Coptic MS, but the Ge'ez reads:

And when he had said this and finished speaking with us, he said to us again, 'Behold, on the third day, at the third hour, the one who sent me will come so that I may go with him.' And as he spoke there was thunder and lightning and an earthquake, and the heavens were torn asunder, and a bright cloud came and took him. And we heard the voice of many angels as they rejoiced and blessed and said, 'Gather us, O priest, to the light of glory!' And when they drew near to the firmament of heaven, we heard him saying, 'Go in peace!' (51.1–4)

This depiction of Jesus' ascension mirrors the depiction of the resurrection in the same text in that they are both very physical understandings of divine events. In EpAp, the more ambiguously corporeal elements of Jesus' resurrection in the canonical accountsm such as appearing in locked rooms are eliminated in favour of the tangible form of a Jesus whose feet are firmly on the ground. This dramatic depiction of Jesus' departure with its apocalyptic imagery is out of keeping with his low-key appearance to the women at the tomb, which

---

[60] Although the language used compares to that of Acts, Meyer rightly notes that '[t]he author of *Ep. Pet. Phil.* is not fighting the theological battles of Luke, and operates with a different scenario', Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 144.

simply reads 'the Lord appeared to them' (ⲁⲡϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ [ⲛⲉ]ⲩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ [10.1]).[61] There are several shared elements between the ascension narrative of EpAp and Acts 1. Common imagery includes the cloud as a symbol of both Jesus' departure (EpAp 51.2) and return (EpAp 16.3; Acts 1.9–11). In EpAp the cloud which 'took him out of their sight' in Acts 1.9 comes all the way down to earth as the vehicle for Jesus' upward journey.

Apocalyptic imagery is also found in the ascension account of ApocPet, and there too the cloud has an active part to play: 'A large cloud, very white, came over our heads, and it carried away our Lord, Moses, and Elijah' (17.2). But ApocPet includes something that would have been appropriate in EpAp but is not there – the affirmation that the righteous are fleshly in heaven: 'We watched, and the heavens were opened. We saw people in the flesh who came and welcomed our Lord and Moses and Elijah, and they went into the second heaven' (17.3). The narrative also refers to fear and trembling in heaven, and then to heaven being closed (17.5–6). Unlike other departure narratives, however, the scene opens with a voice from heaven declaring: 'This is my beloved son, with whom I am pleased. Obey him' (17.1). Here ApocPet links the voice from the synoptic transfiguration to the post-resurrection ascension – if the author understood the two events in this differentiated way.[62]

2.2.7. *John 20–21 and the Issue of 'Physicality'*

The risen Jesus in John 20 is both physical and not. He shows the disciples his wounds and invites Thomas to touch them and even to insert his hand into the laceration (20.27). Yet this is the same physical person who appears in rooms through locked doors (20.19, 27). Even more strangely, when he appears to one of his closest followers, she does not recognize him. (vv.14–15). And in stark contrast to what he offers Thomas, he says to Mary Magdalene, 'Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father' (Μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα [v.17]).[63] Why Jesus tells Mary not to touch him has caused endless confusion for John's readers – Brown refers to at least nine possible interpretations.[64]

---

[61] As Hartenstein writes, it would be more appropriate to parallel it with Christ's descent through the heavens into Mary's womb in chap. 13, and with the description of the Parousia in chap. 16, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 116–17.

[62] Helmer rightly sees this reference to Jesus' ascension as further confirmation of ApocPet's post-resurrection setting, Helmer, 'Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter', 151.

[63] Some MSS add και προσεδραμεν αψασθαι αυτου before Jesus' prohibition, demonstrating the peculiarity of the original text.

[64] Although he notes that some of these arguments are ridiculous: 'One wonders which is worse: the utterly banal explanation that Jesus does not want to be touched because his wounds are still sore, or Belser's fanciful

Many scholars read ἅπτομαι as referring to an emotional holding onto, as in 'stop clinging to me'.[65] But other uses of the word ἅπτομαι in the canonical gospels do not refer to clinging: Jesus does not *emotionally cling* to the slave's ear to heal it (Luke 22.51).[66] The use of ἅπτομαι tends to refer to a healing touch (e.g. Matt 8.3, 8.15), as shown by the declaration of the haemorrhaging woman: 'If I only touch his cloak, I will be made well' (Ἐὰν μόνον ἅψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι [Matt 9.21]).[67] There is little reason to assume John 20.17 uses ἅπτομαι differently. It therefore seems that Jesus is telling Mary not to *touch* him, in contrast to the women touching and holding (κρατέω) Jesus' feet in Matthew (28.9).[68] In light of John 20, the same ambiguity about the physicality of the risen Jesus might be seen in John 21. When Jesus appears in the near distance the disciples do not recognize him (21.4), and only the beloved disciple knows that it is the Lord once he has instructed them how to catch fish (21.6–7). The beloved disciple may only be able to identify Jesus because he has special insight. Peter only *hears* that it is the Lord, he does not see or recognize him (21.7).[69] As the disciples approach him, it is said that 'none of the disciples dared to ask him, "Who are you?" because they knew it was the Lord' (οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν, Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν [v.12]). Here, τολμάω suggests that they wanted to (but did not dare). There is nothing to indicate that the man who manifests himself in locked rooms is here straightforwardly recognizable or tangible.

---

thesis that, having heard of the eucharistic meal on Thursday evening, Mary Magdalene sees Jesus risen and is holding onto him, pleading that he give her holy communion', Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*, 992–93.

[65] As ἅπτομαι may imply either the physical act of touching or the emotional sense of clinging onto Jesus, the present imperative form has been taken to imply a sense of 'stop doing what you are doing', which suggests 'a persistent clinging that fits the emotional character of the encounter', as in Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 1193; Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*, 992. Dodd writes that it 'might mean "Do not cling to me", without any necessary implication that Mary was doing so (since μή with the present imperative may simply negative the specific meaning of that tense)', C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 443 n.2. Although Ridderbos largely agrees with this, he also notes that '[w]e should think of the supernatural character of Jesus' coming as the Risen One, as a result of which contact with him was unlike a natural encounter with the senses', Herman Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997), 636.

[66] 'But Jesus answered (and) said, "No more of this". And he touched his ear and healed him' (ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου, καὶ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου ἰάσατο αὐτόν).

[67] There are many uses of ἅπτομαι in the synoptics, for example healing lepers by touch (Matt 8.3) and healing fever by touching a woman's hand (Matt 8.15).

[68] Schnackenburg, for example, points to the connection with Matthew, Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to John: Vol. 3. Commentary on Chapters 13–21*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon (Kent: Burns & Oates, 1988), 318.

[69] As Brown writes, '[s]eemingly he still could not recognize Jesus visually', Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*, 1072.

The uncertainty about Jesus' physicality in John is much like Luke. Luke presents the risen Jesus as fleshly and fish-eating, yet vanishing and ascending. Jesus proves to the disciples that he is not a πνεῦμα (Luke 24.37–43), yet the Jesus of Luke 24 is different to the Jesus of Luke 1–23: he appears and disappears and reveals hidden truths.[70] Jesus' words 'while I was with you' (ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν [24.44]) shows that his presence now is different to his presence before. The majority of dialogue gospels are not so concerned with the issue of physicality. As we have seen, ApJohn, SophJesChr and PistSoph depict Jesus in a different form. Others, such as DialSav, BookThom and the extant GMary, do not explain the form in which Jesus manifested himself. EpAp, on the other hand, is extremely concerned to show the *physicality* of Jesus:

ετβε ο τετν̄ρ̄διϲταζε ετι τετν̄ε ν̄ατναϩτε αναк πε πεϊ εταϩχοοϲ νητνε ετβε ταϲαρ̄ξ μ̄ν παμου μ̄ν πατωνε χεκααϲ ατετναμ̄με χε αναк πε · πετρε τωκε ν̄νεκϯβε ανειϥτ ν̄ναϭιχ αου ν̄τακ ϩουουκ θωμαϲ τωκε ν̄νεκϯβε ανϲϩ̄ν̄λογχη νπαϲπιρ ν̄τακ δε ανδρεαϲ μουϩ αναουρητε кνο χε ϲετωμε εν απкαϩ ϥϲηϩ γαρ ϩ̄ν̄ ππροφητηϲ χε ουφανταϲια ν̄δαιμον μα[ρε]ρετϥ τουμε ϩιχν̄ πкαϩ αναν δε α[νϭαμ]ϭμε αραϥ χαναμ̄με ναμιε χε νεα[ϥτωνε] ϩν ϲαρ̄ξ αου ανπαϩτνε αχ̄ν̄ [π]ν̄[ϩο ενρ̄εχομολογει ν̄ννابε χε ανϩωπε ν̄[ατνα]ϩτε (11.6–12.2)

Why do you still doubt you unbelievers? It is I, this one who told you about my flesh and my death and my resurrection. So that you will know it is I, Peter thrust your fingers to the nail (marks) in my hands, and Thomas, thrust your fingers into the spear [wounds] in my side, and Andrew, look at my feet and see if they do not join to the ground. For it is written in the prophet that 'a demonic ghost does not ha[ve] his foot joined to the ground'. W[e touch]ed him so that we might truly know that h[e had risen] in the flesh and we bowed [our faces], confess[ing] our sins, for we had been [without] faith.

---

[70] '[T]he Risen One is portrayed on the one hand precisely as if he were still the earthly Jesus: he walks with his disciples, he accepts an invitation to supper in their home, and he breaks the bread before them as he had done during his earthly ministry… Yet on the other hand he is a mysterious "divine man," who appears and disappears at will', Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, 106.

The proof of the risen Jesus' corporeality comes in two ways: touching his wounds and seeing that his feet touch the ground.[71] Having feet on the ground seems to be an alternative to the Lukan account of confirmation by eating. Luke, John and EpAp all have confirmation through touch. Yet, whereas Luke and John 'are emphasizing the corporeal continuity between the earthly and the risen Jesus',[72] EpAp takes their accounts further. The most prominent difference is that EpAp has a single appearance of the risen Jesus. He 'appears' (ογωνϩ) just once. There is no separate appearance to the Eleven – he appears to the women and goes with them to find the men. He does not materialize in locked rooms. Moreover, any hint in the canonical gospels that his resurrected form is unrecognizable or different to the crucified body is resolutely stamped out.

Koester contrasts EpAp's emphasis on the physical reality of Jesus' resurrection with the christophanies of other 'revelation gospels'.[73] However, this dichotomy is unnecessary. Dialogue gospels are varied and most do not engage with the issue. 1ApocJas, however, implies a physical body of the risen Jesus:

> αϥογονϩ εροϥ ⲛϭι πχοε[ιс] ⲛτοϥ ⲇε αϥκα τεπροсεγχ[ⲏ] εβολ αϥμαλϩ̅ϥ ⲛ̅ϩⲏτϥ· αϥⳉ
> ⲡι εⲣⲱϥ (NHC 31,2–5)
> The Lord appeared to him. Then he [James] ceased praying, he embraced him and kissed him.

The significance of this reception by James is emphasized as Jesus specifically comments on it, giving it as the reason why James merits his traditional epithet, 'The Just' (NHC 32,1–8). This is in direct contrast with Jesus' words to Mary Magdalene in John 20.17. 1ApocJas further affirms the corporeal form of the risen Jesus as he sits on a rock with James (NHC 32,15–16). Physicality is not a major issue in 1ApocJas (the text has little regard for the body), but these narrative inserts demonstrate that the physicality of the risen Lord is more affirmed than denied. 1ApocJas is like EpAp in that Jesus returns not as a theophany of light or a polymorphous ghost but as a touchable and huggable human being.

---

[71] The prophecy that refers to a demonic ghost is nowhere to be found. A similar phrase does occur in Ignatius' *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* (οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον [3.2]), which has much in common with this narrative in EpAp.

[72] Raymond E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus* (New York: Paulist Press, 1973), 89.

[73] Helmut Koester, 'One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels', *HTR* 61, no. 2 (1968): 245.

2.3. The Pauline Effect

A resurrection-orientated christology and soteriology in an archon-dwelling cosmos is one way to sum up the impact of Pauline thought in dialogue gospels.

2.3.1. *The Risen Lord*

A focus on the risen Christ occurs in most though not all of the dialogue gospels, and this emphatic focus on the risen Christ appears to stem from Paul. As Paul writes, 'If indeed we once knew Christ according to the flesh, we know [him] no longer' (εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν [2 Cor 5.16]). For Paul, without Jesus' resurrection, there is no point in proclaiming his message, and neither is there salvation:

> εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, κενὸν ἄρα [καὶ] τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, κενὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν… εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν (1 Cor 15.14, 17)
>
> If Christ has not been raised, then our proclamation is in vain and your faith is in vain… If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins.[74]

The Paul-like focus on Jesus' salvific resurrection is evident in dialogue gospels. In EpAp as in Paul, Jesus' resurrection is the precondition for the disciples': 'Truly I say to you, as my Father raised me from the dead, so also you too will be raised and taken above the heavens' (21.1). The resurrection is followed by ascension, and in PistSoph, GMary and 1ApocJas, Jesus' ascension through the heavens paves the way for Christian souls to follow him. In 1ApocJas, James must wait until after Jesus' resurrection before Jesus will reveal his salvation (NHC 29,9–13).

The focus on the risen Lord in Paul may account for the lack of attention paid to the ministry of Jesus in the dialogue gospels. Paul renders it unnecessary for the earthly Jesus to

---

[74] 1 Cor 15 was referred to by more early Christians than any other section of a Pauline letter, Jennifer R. Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*, SBR 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 97. As Pagels notes, among its users were 'Naassene and Valentinian exegetes [who] cite this passage frequently; Irenaeus says it is the Valentinians who insist on introducing texts from 1 Corinthians 15 to support their own position against the "orthodox" [*Adv. Haer.* 5.9.1]; the Gospel of Philip demonstrates such an exegesis [104,26–105,3]', Elaine H. Pagels, '"The Mystery of the Resurrection": A Gnostic Reading of 1 Corinthians 15', *JBL* 93, no. 2 (1974): 277 (references added from the footnotes).

be a focus; he himself has only seen him after his resurrection and yet he can claim the same status as those who followed him from Galilee.

> Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑόρακα; οὐ τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν κυρίῳ; (1 Cor 9.1)
>
> Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not my work in the Lord?

Paul claims that he is in no way to be outranked by the disciples who knew Jesus when he was on the earth, implicitly devaluing pre-Easter traditions.[75] A dialogue with the risen Christ, in which the ministry of the earthly Jesus is relegated to the background and in which Christ as revealer teaches and appoints apostles, could be regarded as a *Pauline* gospel.

2.3.2. *The Ephesian Cosmos*

Many of the dialogue gospels offer salvation from an archon-inhabited cosmos – a worldview found in Ephesians.[76] While Ephesians can depict believers as already seated with Christ in heaven (1.21; 2.6), above the evil cosmic powers, these are still a threat to be combatted (6.12). Glossed with a phrase from Colossians 1.13, the Ephesian image of the powers is quoted (from 'the great apostle') in HypArch, a Nag Hammadi text close in content to ApJohn and SophJesChr, but without the character Jesus.[77]

> ετβε ογυποστασις ⲛⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ϩⲙ ⲡⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ` ⲛⲧⲙⲉ ⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ ϫⲉ ⲡⲛ̄ϣⲱϫⲉ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ` ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲥⲁⲣⲝ ϩⲓ [ⲥⲛⲟ]ϥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϥ`ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥ[ⲙⲟⲥ] ⲙⲛ̣ ⲙⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓⲁ [ⲁⲉⲓ]ϫⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲕϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧⲁ[ⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄]ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ (86,20–27)
>
> On account of the reality of the powers, (inspired) by the spirit of the father of truth, the great apostle – referring to the powers of darkness – told us that our contest is not against flesh and [blood]; but against the powers of the cosmos and spirits of

---

[75] Cf. Robinson, 'Jesus from Easter to Valentinus', 21.

[76] For early exegetes, Ephesians was written by Paul, and so we will often refer to Paul as its author. See Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect*, 57–58.

[77] Hartenstein sees 'erstaunliche Parallelen in den Gattungsmerkmalen' and groups HypArch together with ApJohn and SophJesChr due to their similar cosmology and anthropology, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 258, 260.

wickedness. [I have] sent (you) this because you inquire about the real[ity of the] powers.

A number of dialogue gospels, like the Pauline corpus, understand these evil archons to be connected to the cosmic entities that separate humanity from God: death, life, angels, rulers, things present, things to come, powers, height, depth or anything else in creation (Rom 8.38–39). In Ephesians, Paul is concerned with cosmology – the phrase 'in the heavens' (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις) appears five times (1.3, 20; 2.6; 3.10; 6.12) and must refer to the realm beyond the world where both Jesus and malevolent archons dwell.[78] This realm clearly has different levels as Christ sits 'above every ruler and power and authority and dominion and every name being named, not only in this age but in the coming one' (ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι [Eph 1.20–21]). A similar picture of the cosmos is accepted in 1ApocJas and GMary, which have Jesus or the disciple travelling through hostile heavenly spheres to reach 'Rest' or salvation. They must defeat these powers or archons (or 'toll collectors' in 1ApocJas) by proclaiming that they originated in the heavens above. EpAp has Jesus descending through different cosmic levels to reach Mary's womb (13.1–14.6). Here the heavenly beings are cast as angels who appear to pose no threat to the descending Christ.

In Ephesians the 'plan' (οἰκονομία) for bringing harmony to the disunited cosmos is eschatological – for 'the fullness of time, to gather up all things in Christ, things in heaven and things on earth, in him' (τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν αὐτῷ [1.10]).[79] A comparable idea is found in GMary, in which Jesus has come to restore the unstable cosmos to stability, through dissolution, rendering the harmonization eschatological.[80]

The πλήρωμα language in Eph 1.10 connects the completion of time to the fullness of Christ; cosmology, christology and eschatology are not easily distinguishable in Ephesians. Paul writes about 'the fullness of the one filling all in all' (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου [1.23]). The Greek here is tricky, but Paul seems to be making the

---

[78] *Contra*, Talbert reads it as 'the realm of transcendence', Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 44.

[79] The overriding theme of the letter is God's plan to bring unity to the cosmos, through Christ, and from this, '[o]ne may infer… that the unity and harmony of the cosmos have suffered serious dislocation, on earth and in the heavenlies', Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 47.

[80] This will be explored further in chapter four.

πλήρωμα the body/church while τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου refers to Christ.[81] Yet in Colossians Christ comprises the πλήρωμα: 'For in him [Christ] the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily' (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς [2.9]).[82] Later in Ephesians, πλήρωμα is used to describe an attainable state of being:

μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (4.13)

until all of us come to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God; to a Perfect Man; to the measure of the maturity with reference to the fullness of Christ.

Ephesians has Jesus as the one filling, and fullness as the pinnacle state. Read alongside Col 2.9, that pinnacle state is becoming Christlike. These concepts connect the deutero-Pauline concept of 'fullness' to certain dialogue gospels. ApJas focuses on the idea of fullness, as Jesus takes Peter and James aside 'to fill them' (ⲙⲁϩⲟⲩ [2,35]). It is only by becoming full that they can enter the kingdom of heaven (2,29–33).[83] Read alongside John earlier, it was suggested that 'fullness' is associated with understanding. ApJohn uses the pleroma language differently, as it refers to the entirety of the heavenly, eternal beings. Ephesians likens the fullness of Christ to becoming a ἄνδρα τέλειον – an idea we find in GMary, where Levi exhorts the disciples to put on 'the Perfect Man' (ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ [18,16]).

Paul also invites the Ephesians to 'put on the full armour of god' (ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ [6.11; cf. v.13]) in order to defeat the 'rulers' (ἀρχάς), 'powers' (ἐξουσίας), 'world rulers of this darkness' (κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου) and 'evil spiritual beings in the heavens' (πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις) (6.12). The armour includes the breastplate of righteousness, the equipment of the gospel, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit. In some dialogue gospels, Jesus equips the disciples with the means to overcome the present or post-mortem challenge of the

---

[81] For this reading, see e.g. John Muddiman, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London and New York: Continuum, 2001), 94–96: 'the Church is the fullness of the all-filling Christ' (96).

[82] 'In Colossians, the christological referent of the word πλήρωμα is beyond question', Muddiman, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 95.

[83] Hedrick sees the concept of fullness as a 'common gnostic motif' which has been attached to a 'traditional saying' about who can enter the kingdom (cf. Mark 10.15), Charles W. Hedrick, 'Kingdom Sayings and Parables of Jesus in the Apocryphon of James: Tradition and Redaction', *NTS* 29, no. 1 (1983): 20. On πλήρωμα as a favourite term of 'gnostics', see also Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 129–30.

powers. However, instead of taking up the military imagery, protection from the archons is to be found in remembrance and words. Thus, in GMary and 1ApocJas Jesus teaches that the person must remember to declare to the archons that they are from above (GMary 15,1–17,9; 1ApocJas _NHC_ 33,13–35,30 = _CT_ 19,24–22,23).

EpPetPhil, on the other hand, is much closer to Ephesians in that it includes military language as well as christological and cosmological motifs:

ⲏ ⲡⲱⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛ [ⲛ̄ϯⲉⲝⲟ]ⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ϯⲡⲁⲣⲣⲏⲥⲓⲁ· (134,26–135,1) Again, how do we have [the] authority of boldness?	This was in accordance with the eternal purpose that he has carried out in Christ Jesus our Lord, in whom we have access to God *in boldness and access* (ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ προσαγωγὴν) in confidence through faith in him. (3.11–12)
[ⲏ] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲛⲓϭⲟⲙ ⲥⲉϯ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲛ (135,2) [And] why do the authorities fight against us? ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϭⲟⲙ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲙ̄ⲛ ϩⲉⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ· ⲁⲩⲱ [ⲁ]ϥⲟⲗⲕ̄ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲓⲉⲱⲛ ⲉⲧ̄ⲙⲟ[ⲟ]ⲩⲧ· · ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲓϭⲟⲙ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲩϫⲡⲟⲟⲩ · (135,23–28) And he [the Arrogant One] placed authorities over it and powers. And he enclose[ed] it in the aeons that are d[e]ad. And all the powers of the world rejoiced that he had been begotten.	For our struggle is not against blood and flesh, but against the rulers (ἀρχάς), against the powers (ἐξουσίας), against the cosmic rulers (κοσμοκράτορας) of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavens. (6.12) following the ruler of the power of the air (τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος) (2.2)
ⲧ̄ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉ ⲡϣⲱⲱⲧ· ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲡⲉ[ⲩ]ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ (134,21–23) We wish to know the deficiency of the aeons and [their] fullness. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲓⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲁⲩⲧ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩⲧ· ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲓⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉⲁϥϩⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (136,16–18) But concerning the fullness, I am the one who was sent down in the body because of the seed, which had fallen away.	the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the one filling all in all (1.23) the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God; to a Perfect Man (ἄνδρα τέλειον); to the measure of the maturity with reference to the fullness (πληρώματος) of Christ. (4.13)

ⲛⲓⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲩϯ ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧˋⲥⲁⲅⲟⲩⲛ (137,21–22) For the archons are fighting against the inner man.	I pray that… he may grant that you may be strengthened in your inner man (εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον) with power through his spirit (3.16)
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲱⲕⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲁï ϩⲛ̄ ϯϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲁ[ⲉ]ⲓⲱⲧˋ (137,25–28) And you arm yourselves with the strength of my [F]ather	Put on the whole armour of God (6.11)

Both texts have unity as an overarching theme: Ephesians has cosmic unity and church unity, while EpPetPhil accentuates apostolic unity, with Peter calling Philip to rejoin the apostolic group. Both texts also see the need to take up the armour of the Father and to strengthen the inner man to defeat cosmic powers. To get their ideas across, they both employ terms such as παρρησίαν/ⲡⲁⲣϩⲏⲥⲓⲁ and πλήρωμα/ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ. The question 'how do we have [the] authority of boldness?' in EpPetPhil is surrounded by questions about cosmology, eschatology and salvation, and so, although Meyer sees ⲡⲁⲣϩⲏⲥⲓⲁ as referring to boldness in preaching,[84] it probably has more the sense of boldness needed to overcome the hostile powers. In many ways, it has a similar meaning to παρρησία in Ephesians, which describes Christians' access to God. Thielman sees παρρησία and προσαγωγή being used to describe a close relationship in which Christians can speak freely with God and with each other,[85] but Lincoln reads it in reference to the powers: '[T]he access can be seen as no longer impeded by the menace of hostile principalities and authorities'.[86] In EpPetPhil, it appears to employ both senses.

The language of 'fullness' arose in our earlier discussion of John FD and ApJas, in which the disciples must 'become full' to enter the kingdom. Here we meet this language again, now connecting Ephesians and EpPetPhil.[87] In EpPetPhil NHC 134,22–23, the fullness refers to the aeons, but a scribe corrected it from 'your fullness' (ⲡⲉⲕⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ) to 'their fullness' (ⲡⲉⲩⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ). As Meyer writes, 'it is easy to see how ⲡⲉⲕⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ could be a desirable reading, since the Savior identifies himself with the fullness at 136,16. Yet, as the answer suggests, the restoration of the fullness of others is the purpose of the work of the

---

[84] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 114.
[85] Frank Thielman, *Ephesians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), 218–19.
[86] Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, World Bible Commentary 42 (Waco, TX: Word, 1990), 191.
[87] The indirect question 'we wish to know the deficiency of the aeons and their pleroma' links to the same queries in DialSav: 'What is the fullness and what is the deficiency?' (ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡϣⲱⲱⲧ [139,14–15]).

Savior'.[88] Either ⲡⲉⲕ- or ⲡⲉⲩ- would work: '[T]he orientation of the question was merely changed from the Savior to the aeons, or from Christology to soteriology'.[89] This directly links 'fullness' in EpPetPhil to its use in ApJas and Ephesians: Christ is the one who fills humanity.[90]

The battle language in EpPetPhil is strongly reminiscent of Eph 6.10–20.[91] Meyer sees that both texts are concerned with fighting cosmic powers and that therefore 'their weaponry ought to be correspondingly spiritual'.[92] The 'power of my father' in EpPetPhil is comparable to the 'whole armour of God' in Ephesians. For early Christian exegetes, the armour was conceived in terms of baptism (Ignatius and Origen), wisdom and courage (Clement) or prayer (Tertullian and Origen).[93] In EpPetPhil, the disciples conquer the powers by stripping off the corruptible (i.e. the body) (137,6–9).[94] But they are also to fight the archons by coming together and teaching the world (137,22–25), tying in with the theme of apostolic unity and preaching that runs throughout the letter. Once they have stripped off the flesh, they become 'illuminators' (ⲫⲱⲥⲧⲏⲣ [137,8]) – a term that EpPetPhil also applies to Christ (133,27) and that Paul applied to his addressees in Philippi (τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης, ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ [Phil 2.15]).[95] It is *because* the disciples have become illuminators that they fight the powers, but the *how* is through unity and preaching. They must become Christlike to preach. The same military language is used in both EpPetPhil and Ephesians to emphasize overcoming cosmic powers and unity.

We have examined just a small sample of Pauline motifs, ideas and language found in dialogue gospels. Naturally, there will be similarities and intertextual connections between such authors as they are all grappling with closely related theological questions. In the end, their different historical contexts may push them apart, as Paul focuses on the relation of Gentiles to the Jewish law whereas the majority of dialogue gospels are concerned with cosmology and eschatology. But the thought-world is, in many respects, similar.

---

[88] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 171.

[89] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 113.

[90] Meyer also notes the link with Ephesians and Col 1.19, Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 129.

[91] This passage was widely received in the ancient Christian world. Strawbridge investigates this and argues that early Christians discerned their need to defend themselves against spiritual forces most frequently in contexts either of baptism or persecution, Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect*, 57–96.

[92] Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 142.

[93] Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect*, 78–82.

[94] This has parallels throughout early Christian literature, as we will see in chapter five.

[95] As Meyer writes, 'Just as Christ is a fullness and an illuminator, so also the Gnostics can become fullnesses and illuminators. Christ's fate is their fate, his lot their lot', Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 139.

2.4. Parables and Mysteries

2.4.1. *Parables*

Although Jesus says a lot in the canonical gospels, he leaves so much unanswered. The disciples are often left in a state of confusion, especially after parables. Despite the argument of many scholars that the parables had a life-changing and earth-shattering effect on Jesus' audience, clearly not all early Christians understood them.[96] Clement says that only a select few intelligent people could understand parables through divine teaching (*Strom.* 2.2.7.2), EpAp has the disciples complain that Jesus is again speaking to them in parables that they cannot understand (32.3),[97] and the Jesus of PistSoph promises to speak openly instead of in parables and no longer conceal anything (1.6; 2.85). Even the Johannine disciples only grasp Jesus' message when he gives up his parabolic style (John 16.29).

The synoptic Jesus tells the disciples that he speaks in parables so that those outside his inner circle will not be able to understand his teachings:

Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς (Mark 4.10–12 // Matt 13.10–15, Luke 8.9–10)

When he was alone, those who were around him along with the Twelve asked him about the parables. And he said to them, 'To you has been given the mystery of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything comes in parables, in order that they might look but not perceive, and might listen but not understand, so that they might not turn again and be forgiven.'

---

[96] For criticism of the claim that Jesus' parables had 'a profound and life-changing effect on his audiences', see Mary Ann Beavis, 'The Power of Jesus' Parables: Were They Polemical or Irenic?', *JSNT* 82 (2001): 3–30. She argues that there is no evidence for the claims that parables were 'imbued with a transformative efficacy'.

[97] Hills rightly sees this as illustrating the assumption that the earthly Jesus spoke parabolically as opposed to the risen Lord who does not, Hills, *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum*, 33.

Mark draws a clear distinction between the 'inside' circle who have been given the mysteries and those 'outside' to whom everything remains concealed.[98] The same idea is found in Luke where Peter wants to clarify whether another of Jesus' parables is 'for us' (πρὸς ἡμᾶς) or 'for everyone' (πρὸς πάντας) (12.41). The open/hidden teaching is picked up in ApJas, as the disciples recall and write books about 'the things that the Saviour had said to each of them, whether in a hidden or open manner' (ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲁⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲡⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ· ⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲑⲏⲡ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲛϩ̅ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ [2,11–14]).[99] The same idea is found in GMary as the Lord appears to Mary in a vision to teach her different things to what he taught the wider group – things that are 'hidden' (ϩⲏⲡ) from the 'brothers' (10,8). When Mary recalls this teaching, Andrew declares it heretical (ϩⲛ̅ⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ [17,15]).

As we have already seen, there are strong links between ApJas and John FD. What we did not discuss above is the parallelism between Jesus' use of parables in the two texts.

Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν· ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν (John 16.25)
I have said these things to you in parables; the hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in parables but tell you in plain speech of the Father.

ⲁϩ[ⲓⲣ] ϣⲁⲣⲡ ⲉⲉⲓϣⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̅ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̅ ϩⲣⲏⲓ ϩⲛ̅ ϩⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲣ ⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲛ· ϯ[ⲛ]ⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ϯϣⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̅ⲙⲏⲧ[ⲛ ϩ]ⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̅ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲣ ⲁⲓⲥⲑⲁⲛⲉ ⲉⲛ (ApJas 7,1–6)
At first I spoke to you in parables and you did not understand. No[w] I speak to yo[u] openly and you do not perceive.

---

[98] This hardline distinction generates anxieties in certain exegetes such as France, who writes: 'Few have been content to believe that Jesus really meant to say just that, and there are sufficient ambiguities or obscurities in the wording to allow wide scope for scholarly ingenuity to discover a more appropriate intent', R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 193. According to France, the point is that whether the parable produces a response depends on the 'condition of the hearer… Thus the same parable which to some brings an understanding of the secret of God's kingship will leave others cold. They are the ones who remain ἔξω' (198–99). Beavis, on the other hand, argues that Mark's ancient audience would have had a positive response to the idea of esoteric teaching to an in-group, Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11–12*, JSNTSupp 33 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
[99] Brakke argues that, 'rather than indicating the existence of two distinct kinds of gospels (obscure and plain), this scene more likely characterizes other known Jesus literature as similar to *Ap. Jas.* itself in being a mixture of "secret" and "open" teachings', Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech', 206.

John FD and ApJas appear to parallel the idea of a progression from parables to open teaching. In ApJas, however, Jesus speaks openly in the present, whereas in John 16.25 Jesus tells his disciples that open speech will come in the future. However, by 16.29 the disciples claim that he is speaking clearly (ἐν παρρησίᾳ). In the preceding verse, Jesus tells them that he is from the Father and will return to the Father (16.28), suggesting that Jesus' words have not changed but the disciples finally understand them clearly.[100]

However, ApJas turns on its head the idea of chronological progression from parabolic to open teaching. Alongside speaking 'openly', Jesus is still using parables 550 days after his resurrection. He refers to past parables named 'the shepherds', 'the seed', 'the lamps of the virgins', 'the wage of the labourers' and 'the didrachmae' (8,6–10) but also introduces new parables about the kingdom and a palm shoot, the word as a grain of wheat and an ear of grain (7,22–35; 8,11–27; 12,20–30). If the former parables were teachings from Jesus' earthly life, his resurrection has not brought a new, definitive mode of speech. In ApJas, Jesus speaks a mixture of parables and open speech. As Brakke writes, '*Ap. Jas.* does not rigidly assign parabolic speech to the life of the earthly Jesus and plain speech to appearances of the risen Jesus; rather, it presents all of Jesus' discourse as a combination of these two'.[101]

Furthermore, the parables in ApJas are not associated with concealment either before or after the resurrection. The astute disciple understood the parables the first time simply by hearing them (7,35–8,10). Peter and James lack such insight and continue to struggle with Jesus' teachings:

πετρος ⲛⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲉⲓ ⲡⲁ[ⲝ]ⲉϥ ⲭⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲕⲣ̄ ⲡⲣⲟⲧⲣⲉⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣ̄ⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲥⲁⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲕⲥⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ· ⲡⲭⲁⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡ· ⲙⲉⲛ ⲕⲣ̄ ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲥⲱⲕ· ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕϣⲡⲱⲡ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛϩ̄ ϩⲛⲕⲉⲥⲁⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲕϩⲃⲁⲣⲃⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ (ApJas 13,25–36)

Then Peter replied to these words and said, 'Sometimes you urge us toward the kingdom of heaven, and at other times you turn us back. Lord, sometimes you

[100] Brown argues that the disciples are simply 'being impetuous' and that 'they are not much closer to true understanding than they were when they asked naïve questions earlier in the Discourse', Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*, 732.
[101] Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech', 206. In 1ApocJas too, Jesus begins the higher teaching before the crucifixion but will leave some to be revealed afterwards.

persuade and draw us to faith and promise us life, and at other times you cast us forth from the kingdom of heaven'.

Brakke regards ApJas as working within the Platonic doctrine of 'intellectual understanding' and 'sense perception' used also by Clement and Origen. ApJas, he argues, 'presents Jesus' parables as means to "intellectual understanding" and thus superior to Jesus' plain speech, which offers merely "sense perception"'.[102] The text places the focus on the disciples rather than Jesus – the disciples must work to understand the meaning of the parables.

Overall, dialogue gospels appear to respond to the problem of Jesus' perplexing teachings with Jesus responding to the disciples' questions with clear and often lengthy revelations. EpAp refers to parabolic teaching as a thing of the past, suggesting that, like Luke, the risen Lord will reveal what was previously concealed or misunderstood.[103] However, ApJas demonstrates that the earthly-parables/risen-open dichotomy is not a division that works in every case. Just as the Johannine Jesus speaks openly before his crucifixion, the Jesus of ApJas speaks in parables after his resurrection. The stronger connection between these texts is not sequential modes of revelation but the continuation of the themes of hidden/open teachings and the disciples' ongoing attempts to understand Jesus' message.

2.4.2. *Mysteries*

As we have seen, Mark links parables and mystery, contrasting those that are given the mystery with those who receive parables (4.11). Mystery language permeates early Christian literature and usually refers to hidden things, although it can be used in a very loose sense.[104]

---

[102] Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech', 207–8.
[103] Parables are also discussed and explained in PistSoph and ApocPet. PistSoph paraphrases Matt 10.12–13, referring to it as a 'parable' that Jesus once spoke. Jesus then interprets the instruction to bestow his peace on worthy households as their reception of the mysteries (3.107 [247,7–248,11]). ApocPet reformulates the parable of the fig tree in Matt 24.32–35 and Luke 13:6–9, replacing 'the summer' in Matt 24.32 with the Parousia: 'as soon as its shoots have gone forth and its boughs have sprouted, the end of the world will come' (2.1). Peter needs an explanation, and Jesus tells him that the tree is the House of Israel, and that when its boughs sprout false messiahs will come and there will be martyrs (2.2,7–10). On this, see Richard Bauckham, 'The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter', *JBL* 104, no. 2 (1985): 269–87; Julian V. Hills, 'Parables, Pretenders, and Prophecies: Translation and Interpretation in the Apocalypse of Peter 2', *Revue Biblique* 98, no. 4 (1991): 560–73.
[104] As noted by Strousma, the word μυστήριον 'has obviously a very broad semantic spectrum in late antiquity, and is more often than not ambivalent or used in a metaphoric or at least a rather loose sense', Guy G. Stroumsa, *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*, 2nd ed. (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 64.

Lang studies the mystery language in Paul and states that in the majority of the undisputed letters the term 'mystery' refers to

> some newly revealed and plainly stated eschatological or christological fact… [T]he term designates some important truth of Christian theology or eschatology that was previously hidden and has now been made known…[105]

Dialogue gospels purport to reveal Jesus' mysteries. ApJohn begins by proclaiming itself as containing '[t]he teaching [of the saviour and] the re[vel]ation of mysteries [and the th]ings hidden in silence' (ⲧⲉⲥⲃⲱ [ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲁⲩⲱ] ⲡϭ[ⲱⲗ]ⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗˋ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ [ⲙⲛ ⲛⲉ]ⲧϩⲏⲡˋ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ [NHC2 1,1–4]). Although this opening only occurs in Codex 2, all recensions conclude that John received the 'mystery' from the Saviour as well as containing references to mysteries throughout. The term appears to encompass the teachings of the text as a whole as well as referring to specific mysteries such as the 'mystery of their life' (ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲱⲛϩ [BG 56,8–9]), which is an interpretation of Gen 2–3.[106] DialSav refers to the 'mystery of truth' (ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ̣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ [143,8]), in a passage that Létourneau understands as a reference to 'receiving the revelation from the Savior ("to stand or be established in the mystery of truth") [which] allows the elect to recognize themselves and make themselves known to humanity'.[107] Mystery and revelation are also connected in both recensions of 1ApocJas:

> ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲧⲉ ϯⲛⲁϭⲱⲗⲡ̄ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ (NHC 25,5–7)
> Behold, I shall reveal to you everything of this mystery.

> ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ϭⲱⲗⲡ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ (CT 11,8–9)
> Behold, I have revealed to you the mystery.

---

[105] T. J. Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century*, BZNW 219 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 40.

[106] On this, and mystery/mysteries more generally in ApJohn, see Karen L. King, 'Mystery and Secrecy in The Secret Revelation of John', in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices*, ed. Christian H. Bull, Liv Ingeborg Leid, and John D. Turner, NHMS 76 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 61–86.

[107] Pierre Létourneau, 'The Dialogue of the Savior as a Witness to the Late Valentinian Tradition', *VC* 65, no. 1 (2011): 90.

Jenott sees a major christological difference in the two recensions as the future tense in the Nag Hammadi version points the reader to the mystery in the discourse that follows, whereas the past tense in Codex Tchacos identifies the mystery with the foregoing christological discourse, marked by a paragraphus between the two instructions to 'behold'.[108] This previous discourse has explained that Jesus came to show James the highest deity and where he is from ($_{CT}$ 10,8–11,8). Thus, by revealing the mystery, Jesus reveals to James his salvation. The future tense in the NHC version 'casts Jesus' opening discourse as an introduction to the rest of the treatise, so that the reader expects to learn "each part" of the mystery in what follows'.[109] The beginning of 1ApocJas reveals the nature of the relationship between Jesus and the 'One Who Is' – for CT this is the mystery, but for NHC this is just an introduction to the mystery of James' salvation.

2.4.3. *Who can be Weaned?*

Mysteries are often associated with secrecy – and secrecy is widespread in dialogue gospels. The titles 'apocryphon' or 'apocalypse' both pertain to secrecy.[110] To whom mysteries can be disclosed is a matter of contestation, and brings us back to Paul and John. The secret and concealed nature of mysteries is clear in 1 Cor 2:

> σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν. (1 Cor 2.6–8)

---

[108] Lance Jenott, 'Reading Variants in James and the Apocalypse of James: A Perspective from New Philology', in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, ed. Liv Ingeborg Leid and Hugo Lundhaug (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 76. On the paragraphus: 'At the beginning of the discourse, just where Jesus says "Listen" (CT 10.8), the scribe marked the passage with a paragraphus in the left-hand margin, and on the next page punctuated its logical conclusion with a series of diplai(>>>) inside the textual column (CT 11.7), thus demarcating the entire passage in an inclusio. Because of the infrequency of the paragraphus in CT (there are only three extant instances in the codex: pp. 10, 61, 63) it was apparently used to mark passages which the scribe regarded as especially significant' (76).

[109] Jenott, 'Reading Variants in James and the Apocalypse of James', 76.

[110] On the title 'apocalypse', for 1ApocJas in NHC 5, Jenott writes: 'The function of the term "apocalypse" in the title can therefore be understood as a mode of religious advertising insofar as it promises to offer the reader secret truths, now revealed, which Jesus had originally delivered to James, and which were later recorded and transmitted for posterity. Simultaneously, the title enhances the religious self-esteem of the reader as someone privileged enough to receive such revelation him- or herself', Jenott, 'Reading Variants in James and the Apocalypse of James', 66.

But wisdom we do speak among the perfect, but a wisdom not of this age nor of the rulers of this age who are passing away. But rather we speak in a mystery the wisdom of God, which has been hidden, which God ordained before the ages for our glory, which none of the rulers of this age have known.[111]

Who are the perfect? The 'perfect' who speak the wisdom of God are later equated with the spiritual: 'And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual' (ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ᾽ ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες [2.13]), who have the 'mind of Christ' (νοῦν Χριστοῦ [v.16]). The Corinthians do not make the cut:

> Κἀγώ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε. ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε, ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοί ἐστε. (1 Cor 3.1–3)
>
> And so, brothers and sisters, I could not speak to you as spiritual people, but rather as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ. I fed you with milk, not solid food, for you were not ready for solid food. Even now you are still not ready, for you are still of the flesh.

The Corinthians are not able (or ready) to be weaned onto Paul's solid food.

Although these verses are considered favourites of the secretive 'gnostics', no one could more explicitly endorse this idea than Ignatius:

> Μὴ οὐ δύναμαι ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια γράψαι; ἀλλὰ φοβοῦμαι, μὴ νηπίοις οὖσιν ὑμῖν βλάβην παραθῶ καὶ συγγνωμονεῖτέ μοι, μήποτε οὐ δυνηθέντες χωρῆσαι στραγγαλωθῆτε. (*Ep. Trall.* 5.1)
>
> Am I not able to write to you about heavenly things? But I am afraid that I may harm you who are still infants. Grant me this concession – otherwise you may choke, not being able to swallow.

---

[111] Translation from Lang, adapted. On translation points here, see Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness*, 55–56.

Ignatius continues by telling the Trallians that he is able 'to understand the heavenly realms and angelic realms and hierarchies of the cosmic rulers, both visible and invisible' (δύναμαι νοεῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς καὶ τὰς συστάσεις τὰς ἀρχοντικάς, ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα [*Ep. Trall.* 5.2]). The Pauline association continues, as Ignatius urges his readers to eat only Christian food as foreign foods are heresy (6.1).

Ignatius' rhetoric draws together Paul's reference to infants and the Nicodemus of John 3. Nicodemus is not able (or ready) to receive higher teaching: Jesus says to him, 'If I told you about the earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you about the heavenly things?' (εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε; [John 3.12]). To use Pauline language, Nicodemus is not ready for solid food. The same concept is found in BookThom, which also picks up on the dichotomy between knowledge of the earthly and the heavenly things, employing the language of visible/invisible:

> ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙ[ⲟ]ⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉϣⲡⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲥⲉϩⲏⲡ ⲛ[ⲛ]ⲁϩⲣⲛ ⲧⲏⲛⲉ ⲛϩⲉ ⲉⲩⲛ ϭⲁⲙ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲁⲛⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲥⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ (BookThom 138,27–30)
>
> The saviour answered, saying, 'If the things that are visible to you are obscure to you, how can you hear about the things that are not visible?'

The invisible things are not just out of sight, they are 'hidden things' (ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ [128,24–25]).

BookThom does not answer the question of who can be weaned – Thomas is concerned with preaching, perhaps suggesting that this revelation is not to be hidden from anyone. A more overt answer is found in other dialogue gospels which indicate that solid food is given to 'those who are worthy'. The secrecy and revelation theme is often linked to 'gnostic inner-circles' associated with 'the aura of novelty and exclusiveness';[112] but in many dialogue gospels this interpretation is in direct conflict with the text's appeal to universal mission (as seen in our discussion of Matthew 28 earlier in the chapter).

This calls us to challenge our assumptions about the esoteric nature of certain so-called 'gnostic' dialogue gospels – and specifically ApJohn, an 'apocryphon'. In all versions

---

[112] Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 8.

106

of ApJohn we find a declaration that John is to write down all that the Saviour has told him 'and give them to your fellow spirits in secret' (ⲛ̅ⲅ̅ⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲕϩⲟⲙⲟⲡⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ϩⲙ ⲡⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ [BG 75,6–9]). John then goes to 'his fellow disciples' (ⲛⲉϥϣⲃⲣ̅ ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ [BG 77,1–2]) and tells them what he has heard. The term 'apocryphon' along with 'fellow spirits' has led some to see ApJohn to be limited to an 'Empfängerkreis'[113] or a 'chosen few'.[114] But King rightly interprets the language that ApJohn uses in the same way that similar language is employed in the canonical gospels and Paul. She writes: 'There, too, Jesus is depicted as a heavenly Savior, who imparts secret teaching to a chosen few'.[115] She identifies the problem of presuming that the language of secret revelation 'must necessarily correlate to a socially exclusive group', when '[s]cholars have in fact argued the opposite in the case of the gospels and Paul'.[116]

> Indeed nothing in the mere use of such themes suggests that this 'pattern' of secrecy, when deployed by some Christians, is distinctively 'Gnostic' and indicates a secret society whose membership is limited to an elite, while the same pattern used by 'canonical' Christians supposedly indicates exoteric tradition and presumably a correspondingly open (non-elite) social group. All these cases combine claims of secret revelation with practices of universal mission.[117]

We might take this further – clearly the 'fellow spirits' are the 'disciples', and there is no indication that there are Christians who could not become disciples. In fact, the text itself says that the spirit is in every human or they would not be able to stand (BG 67,4–7), but some are led astray by the counterfeit spirit (BG 67,14–18). Perhaps John's 'fellow spirits' are all humans,[118] and the secret disclosure is to keep this knowledge hidden from the evil archons. ApJohn then appears to be no more restrictive than Paul's letters to the Corinthians (for

---

[113] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 64.
[114] Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 7.
[115] King, 'Mystery and Secrecy in The Secret Revelation of John', 70.
[116] King, 'Mystery and Secrecy in The Secret Revelation of John', 71.
[117] King, 'Mystery and Secrecy in The Secret Revelation of John', 71.
[118] See also Michael A. Williams, 'Secrecy, Revelation, and Late Antique Demiurgical Myths', in *Rending the Veil: Concealment and Secrecy in the History of Religions*, ed. Elliot R. Wolfson (New York: Seven Bridges Press, 1999), 50. The external evidence backs this up: the teachings of ApJohn appear to be relatively widely known. ApJohn is found today in four recensions, was known to Irenaeus (in some form), and promulgated in at least two languages (see 37–41).

which Lang suggests 'the spirituals' means the 'ethically sound' Christians rather than an exclusive group[119]).

The idea that the teachings of ApJohn were intended to be delivered universally may be a stretch too far. But it does appear that it saw the mature who were able to digest solid food in the same way as other Christian groups. So on the question of who could be weaned, the 'gnostic' dialogue gospels are not dissimilar from other early Christian texts. The overriding attitude towards the question of who could be weaned is nicely summed up by GThom:

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓ̈ϫⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ[ⲧⲙ̄ⲡϣⲁ] ⲛ̄[ⲛⲁ]ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ (GThom 62)
Jesus said: 'I tell my mysteries to those who are [worthy] of [my] mysteries.'

In the dialogue gospels, Jesus' departure indicates the beginning of the time of the disciples' own independent agency. The departure of Jesus enacts a division between past and future, and the disciples are the future. And this is the time of disclosure. This finds its antecedent in Paul, who sees himself and other disciples of Christ as administrators of the mysteries (1 Cor 4.1),[120] which are to be disclosed (1 Cor 15.51–52). The secrecy and revelation theme then is not novel in the dialogue gospels, nor does it pertain to exclusivity. Rather, it connects a wide range of Christian traditions, including the canonical gospels and Paul.

Conclusion

There is a plethora of intertextual connections between dialogue gospels and the texts that came to be in the New Testament, particularly the canonical gospels and the Pauline epistles. Dialogue gospels were not written or read in isolation. They belong in a wider context of broader traditions narrating events around Jesus' departure and resurrection, asking who is to be left in charge, and how to enact the mission charge. It is these traditions, that are found in the New Testament, that influenced and shaped the dialogue gospels.

---

[119] Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness*, 66.
[120] In 1 Cor 4.1, Lang sees 'the apostles' standing as "administrators of the mysteries of God" is correlated with their identity as "servants of Christ"', Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness*, 34.

The Johannine farewell discourse is integral to understanding other texts in the genre as it acts as their precursor: Focused on Jesus' departure, select disciples ask Jesus how to follow him in both life and death, for both the individual and the community. In placing John FD in parallel with other dialogue gospels, light can be shed both ways. Yet John FD differs from many dialogue gospels in its temporal setting: it is Jesus' farewell before his crucifixion, rather than his ascension (although Johannine theology may blur this distinction somewhat). The post-resurrection dialogues find close connections with the resurrection accounts of the canonical gospels, Acts 1 and 1 Cor 15, being fashioned from the themes we find in these earlier texts: the question of the leading disciple, the mission charge, the form of Jesus' resurrection body, the primacy of post-resurrection revelation, and the question of whether the risen Jesus could and should be touched. Dialogue gospels present these various issues differently. They might choose a key disciple, they might allay fears about mission, they might depict Jesus as a luminous being, they might reveal previously hidden things and/or they might affirm the physicality of the risen Christ. However much the depictions of Jesus within the dialogue gospels contrast with one another, they may be no more or less divergent than those that we find within the canonical resurrection narratives. Nor are the narratives in the dialogue gospels fundamentally different from their canonical counterparts. Admittedly Mark's Longer Ending does not speak of a Jesus with three faces as ApJohn does, but nor does it preclude it.

Although dialogue gospels have closer textual links with the canonical gospels than other texts of the New Testament, there is a firm influence from Paul and the deutero-Pauline epistles. There are a number of possible topics that could have been discussed here, but three have provided the main focus: (1) the emphasis on the risen Lord, at the expense of the earthly Jesus, (2) the Ephesian view of liberation from the cosmic powers through Christ, and (3) mysteries that must be withheld from the immature. The Pauline thought-world disclosed by these three topics is continuous with what we find in many of the dialogue gospels. Paul's interest in mysteries that cannot be taught to those that are not ready stands alongside Mark's view of parabolic teaching for those 'outside' and John's depiction of Nicodemus' lack of ability to perceive higher teaching. I have argued that we find similar ideas in the dialogue gospels, but those that have been viewed as 'gnostic' have been interpreted in an esoteric way, in contrast to Paul, Mark and John. Yet the canonical and non-canonical texts converge at this point: Jesus' mysteries will be revealed to those who are worthy, i.e. his Christian followers. The Matthean universal commission is also echoed in a number of these dialogue

gospels, suggesting that they were intended for general use and not just for an elite – much like the New Testament texts.

The broad trends that link the texts within the dialogue gospel genre relate to those in the canonical gospels and Paul, and there are many cases of more pointed textual or thematic links. This discussion of the genre and its relation to the New Testament has been framed in a way to highlight the fact that dialogue gospels are a part of the same literary world as other gospels and early Christian literature more generally. This wide-ranging demonstration of intertextual connections has been far from comprehensive, but it may serve to draw attention to a neglected body of literature from which useful comparisons can be drawn that illuminate aspects of the concerns, inspirations and motivations of early Christian authors.

To sharpen the discussion and to engage in more sustained exegetical work, we now turn our attention to a single text: the Gospel of Mary.

Part Two

Chapter Three

The Narrative Frame of the *Gospel of Mary*

The basic outline of the format of GMary is a series of dialogues enclosed by a narrative frame.[1] The beginning six pages of GMary are no longer extant, but we can assume that there was a short narrative there in order to set the scene. This is followed by a dialogue between the Saviour and his disciples, of which only the final two questions survive. A separate farewell discourse concludes Jesus' teachings, which we include in the narrative frame as it is essential to the narrative that follows. Without Jesus' departure, the rest of the material would not make sense. As Jesus departs, Mary arises, comforts the disciples and reminds them of Jesus' teaching. This chapter will examine how she is portrayed in relation to the male disciples and in relation to Jesus. Three pages are missing from Mary's teaching, but it starts with a vision that she has of Jesus and finishes with a narrative of a personified Soul ascending through the heavens, and this leads on to the next part of the narrative frame: the breach between the disciples. Peter and Andrew cannot accept what Mary has said and accuse the revelation of being strange and secretive. Levi jumps in, likening Peter to the hostile cosmic powers that the Soul has overcome; and this leads to a rather inconclusive ending – one or more disciples go out to preach the gospel, but the question of who differs between the Greek and Coptic versions.[2] The narrative frame encompasses the missing beginning, the Saviour's farewell speech and departure, Mary consoling the male disciples, the ensuing argument and the breach following her teaching. This chapter follows this outline.

Despite the genre of 'dialogue gospel', the narrative frame is just as integral to understanding the message of GMary as the eschatological teachings in the dialogues. The dialogue and the narrative frame are more integrated in GMary than in other dialogue

---

[1] My understanding of the narrative frame is the same as Hartenstein's, who includes 8,11–10,16 and 17,7–19,2, Judith Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*, TU 146 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), 137–42. The two revelatory dialogues (between the Saviour and his disciples and Mary's recollection of her vision) are separate from the narrative frame.

[2] Hartenstein divides GMary into four parts: (1) the beginning and no longer extant appearance and dialogue; (2) Jesus' final instructions, his disappearance and the reaction of the disciples; (3) the disciples gathered together, arguing about his words; and (4) the post-vision disciples and departure, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 142. An alternative way of structuring GMary is provided by King, who writes: 'It is structured as a series of dialogues and departures: 1) the dialogue between the Savior and the disciples, followed by the Savior's departure; 2) the dialogue among the disciples, followed by their departure (or at least Levi's departure) to preach the gospel; 3) the dialogue between the Savior and Mary, ending in her silence; and 4) the dialogues between the soul and the Powers, culminating in the soul's departure from the world to its final resting place', Karen L. King, *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2003), 30.

gospels.[3] SophJesChr, for example, looks to be a narrative frame imposed on a pre-existing dialogue (which equates to Eugnostos). In GMary, the Saviour's departure is necessary for the following text; and Mary's teaching leads to the argument between the disciples.

3.1. The Beginning of GMary: The Missing Pages

There are six missing pages at the beginning of *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (BG). Based on a papyrological analysis of the Greek papyrus fragment, PRyl.GM, in comparison to BG, it is safe to assume that these six pages were the opening of GMary. The extant BG is paginated 7–10 and 15–19 and the *recto* (→) and *verso* (↓) of PRyl.GM are numbered 21 and 22. PRyl.GM covers 17,4 to 19,5 (the end) of BG. It can be assumed that the Rylands codex contained a single text, as was typical of gospel codices in the second and third centuries, and so GMary must have taken up the whole 22 pages.[4] As PRyl.GM contains the end of GMary, the BG GMary is likely to be the *entire* 19 pages.[5]

It is appropriate then to begin a discussion of the narrative frame by asking what was written in the beginning six pages. This poses a number of questions, including: Did the text contain a passion or resurrection narrative? Where did Jesus appear, and what were the disciples doing? What is the purpose of the text? Working within the limitations of the fragmentary state of GMary, these questions can only begin to be answered by examining comparable sources. As we have seen with Hartenstein and Perkins in chapter one, dialogue gospels often begin with a narrative setting, which introduces and sometimes authenticates the revelation. Although it is impossible to be certain how GMary begins, suggestions can be made.

In the body of dialogue gospels, the extant GMary is one with more narrative throughout. The text narrates the Saviour's departure, Mary's rising, her weeping and the

---

[3] Despite Hartenstein's general assumption that dialogue gospels can be separated into a Christian narrative frame and non-Christian teachings in the dialogues, for GMary she rejects all earlier hypotheses of disunity and redaction, stating that 'das EvMar ist eine durchaus kohärente und in seiner jetzigen Form verständliche Schrift', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 137. On the general assumption see her introduction and pp.280–83.

[4] In the *editio princeps*, Roberts writes, on a palaeographical basis, that '463 can hardly be later than the middle of the third century and probably is considerably earlier', C. H. Roberts, '463: The Gospel of Mary', in *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), 20.

[5] This problem has been noted by Tuckett who concludes that GMary was probably the first text of the codex, Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Gospel of Mary* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 6 n.8. Till, however, suggests that the complete Rylands version may have been longer than the Coptic, Walter C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, TU 60, 2nd Ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), 25.

disciples' departure. It would be odd, then, if there was no narrative at the beginning. Based on Perkins' argument that the 'opening narratives [of revelation dialogues] are more uniformly stylized than the concluding ones',[6] and by employing a comparative approach and focusing on the teachings of the gospel, several possibilities for pages 1–6 can be suggested. In the discussion that follows, some texts will be cited more frequently than others, for their setting, their dialogue form, or, in most cases, both – especially SophJesChr, John FD, PistSoph, and the resurrection accounts in John 20, Matt 28 and Mark LE. Other, less frequent, comparisons will be drawn from ApJohn, 1ApocJas, DialSav and EpPetPhil. A common feature of these texts is that the dialogue takes place after Jesus' resurrection (with the exception of the first part of 1ApocJas[7]), indicating that GMary is a post-resurrection dialogue.

As a preliminary point of caution, all dialogue gospels are unique. GMary is unlike existing texts of this genre as the narrative continues extensively beyond the Saviour's departure (although he makes another appearance in Mary's recollection). Therefore, any suggestions regarding the missing material based on the genre are highly speculative. In fact, basing a reconstruction on relatively similar material could be a serious error of judgement. If the genealogy of Matthew had been lost and we were to base a reconstruction on the Lukan infancy narrative, due to the gospels being the same *bios* genre and subsequently sharing a lot of the same material, we would be so far from the historical gospel text that it would be more useful to omit a reconstruction altogether. Therefore, the following proposals do not pretend to act as a reconstruction but instead to highlight the teachings in the extant text and to situate GMary within the body of dialogue gospel literature.

3.1.1. *A Resurrection Account?*

Despite clear differences between GMary and the canonical gospels, it is possible that pages 1–6 of GMary brought them into closer contact. Hartenstein thinks so, suggesting that there was a resurrection narrative at the beginning of the gospel, based on the parallel language for the actions of the Saviour and Mary:

---

[6] Pheme Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), 41.

[7] DialSav is not explicitly post-resurrection, but it is likely to be, as discussed in chapter one.

ⲁϥⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟʹⲟʹⲥ ϫⲉ (8,12–14)

He said farewell (ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ) to them all saying …

ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲥⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ … (9,12–14)

Then Mary rose, greeted (ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ) them all, she said …

There is undoubtedly a parallel between these two phrases, but it is difficult to know what is intended by it. Hartenstein focuses on the word ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ, arguing not only that '[s]ie steht auf, was die Bedeutung ihrer Worte unterstreicht', but also that ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ has stronger implications than 'stood up'.[8] As ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ is used for Jesus being raised from the dead in SophJesChr ($_{BG}$ 77,9–10) and ApJas (2,20–21), she suggests that ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ could have been used for the Saviour's resurrection in pages 1–6: 'Marias Auftreten ist daher eine gewisse Parallele'.[9]

There is no clear answer as to whether the gospel once contained a resurrection narrative, but it is possible. Textual parallels illustrate that eschatological and soteriological revelation (key themes in GMary) commonly took place in a post-resurrection setting, and therefore the evangelist may have wanted to make this explicit. However, considering that by page 7 the Saviour had told the disciples 'everything' (ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ [7,11]), there would be little room left for an extended resurrection narrative. At best, the resurrection account would be brief. If GMary contained one, it may have read like SophJesChr, which opens with the words, 'After he rose from the dead' (ⲙⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲣⲉϥⲧⲱⲟⲩ̅ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ [$_{BG}$ 77,9–10]), or PistSoph, 'But it happened that after Jesus had risen from the dead, he spent eleven years speaking with his disciples' (ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ⲧⲣⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲣ̅ⲙ̅ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̅ⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ (1.1 [2,1–3]).[10] GMary could have employed a similar incipit to stress the Saviour's resurrected status and establish the setting for the revelation.

---

[8] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 146.

[9] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 146.

[10] Cf. Book 4, which is often seen as separate from 1–3, has a different opening: 'Now it happened when they crucified our Lord Jesus, he rose from the dead on the third day. His disciples gathered to him and entreated him, saying…' (ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϭⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟⲩⲥ⳨ⲟⲩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲁϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϥⲙⲉϩϣⲟⲙⲛ̅ⲧ ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲟⲩ · ⲁⲩⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲃ̅ϩ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ (4.136 [353,1–4]). The use of ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ in both book 1 and book 4 of PistSoph, potentially strengthens Hartenstein's proposal. Furthermore, GMary 9,10–12 suggests a possible reference to crucifixion and suffering of Jesus as the disciples say that 'they' did not spare him. The 'they' refers to the 'nations' or the 'gentiles' (ϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ) in contrast to the 'the Jews' as the agents of the crucifixion in Luke and GPeter.

Whether or not the gospel began like SophJesChr or PistSoph, Hartenstein's suggestion leads to a more fruitful speculation: that GMary's setting is more closely connected to the canonical gospels than has previously been assumed. Again, the post-Easter setting is stressed as the connection lies primarily in the resurrection narratives. Mary Magdalene plays a role in every post-resurrection scene of the canonical gospels and GMary could be seen as a continuation of Christ's appearance to her.[11] In Matthew, Mary Magdalene along with ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία (28.1) are met by Jesus who instructs them to tell the others about his resurrection (28.10). In Luke, Mary Magdalene and the other women tell the apostles that they have seen an angel at the tomb (24.11). But it is Mark LE and John 20 that are particularly comparable. The LE of Mark opens:

Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωῒ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια. ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν· κἀκεῖνοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῇ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἠπίστησαν. (Mark 16.9–11)

After he rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. She went out and told those who had been with him, while they were mourning and weeping. But when they heard that he was alive and had been seen by her, they would not believe it.

---

[11] This is based on the assumption that Mary in GMary is Mary Magdalene, as in Till, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, 26; Anne Pasquier, *L'Évangile Selon Marie*, BCNH:T 10 (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1983), 23, n.75; Michel Tardieu and Jean-Daniel Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique. I: Collections retrouvées avant 1945* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986), 20; Karen L. King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', in *Searching the Scriptures, II: A Feminist Commentary*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 601; Antti Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*, NHMS 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 94–95; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 130; Karen L. King, 'Why All the Controversy? Mary in the Gospel of Mary', in *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*, ed. F. Stanley Jones, SBL Symposium Series 19 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 53–74; King, *Mary*; Dieter Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien: Studien zu Neuen Texten und zu Neuen Fragen*, NovTSupp 112 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004), 110–11; Esther A. de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary: Listening to the Beloved Disciple* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 16–18; Tuckett, *Mary*, 14–18. Marjanen identifies Mary as Mary Magdalene due to the spelling of her name, Antti Marjanen, 'The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts', in *Which Mary?*, 31–42. Lucchesi questions this assumption, writing 'ce qui est loin d'être prouvé', E. Lucchesi, 'Évangile selon Marie ou Évangile selon Marie-Madeleine?', *Analecta Bollandiana* 103, no. 3–4 (1985): 366. The Magdalene assumption has again been challenged by Stephen J. Shoemaker, 'Rethinking the "Gnostic Mary": Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition', *JECS* 9, no. 4 (2001): 555–95. There is the possibility that Mary of GMary is an assimilation of various Marys from the Jesus tradition, but predominantly based on Mary Magdalene due to the text's connections with John 20.14–18.

Mary Magdalene also plays a prominent role in John 20. She visits Jesus' tomb and does not find his body there. While standing outside of the tomb, she speaks to two angels and explains that she is weeping because Jesus' body is missing. Then she turns around to see Jesus,

> … καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· γύναι, τί κλαίεις; τίνα ζητεῖς; ἐκείνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστιν λέγει αὐτῷ κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτόν, εἰπέ μοι ποῦ ἔθηκας αὐτόν, κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἀρῶ. λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς Μαριάμ. στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστί ραββουνι, ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν. Ἔρχεται Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον, καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ. (John 20.14–18)
>
> … but she did not know that it was Jesus. Jesus said to her, 'Woman, why are you crying? Whom do you seek?' Thinking he was the gardener, she said, 'Sir, if you have carried him away, tell me where you have put him, and I will take him away.' Jesus said to her, 'Mary.' Having turned around, she said to him in Aramaic, 'Rabbouni!' (which means 'Teacher'). Jesus said to her, 'Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and tell them, I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' Mary Magdalene went to the disciples bringing the news: 'I have seen the Lord!' And she told them that he had said these things to her.

Mark LE shows four particular similarities with GMary: 1) Jesus appears first to Mary Magdalene alone; 2) Mary tells the other disciples what she has seen; 3) the two verbs πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν appear superfluous, however, we find the same form in GMary: 'but they were grieved, they wept much' (ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲗⲏⲡⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱϫⲁ [9,5–6]); and 4) the other disciples doubt her words.[12] For John 20 the first two points are the same: Jesus appears

---

[12] The theme of 'doubt' is in all of the Synoptics. In Luke, the Eleven and others do not believe the women's testimony: καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς (24.11). Assuming that 24.12 is part of the original text, it is only Peter that finds their story plausible (24.12). The doubting in Matthew relates to the appearance of Jesus (28.17); in contrast, the male disciples must believe the women's testimony as they go to Galilee on their instruction (28.8–10, 16).

first to Mary alone and Mary tells the other disciples what she has seen. Mary's words in John ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον (20.18) are almost verbatim to GMary's 'I saw the Lord in a vision' (ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ [10,10–11]).[13] Pasquier, Petersen and Tuckett argue that John 20 is in the background of GMary[14] and D'Angelo suggests that 'there is a closer continuity between Mary of the fourth gospel and Mary of the Gospel of Mary than is usually recognized. Both depict Mary as prophet and originator of the mission'.[15] There are certainly intertextual links, pointing towards a shared tradition of Mary seeing the (resurrected) Lord.

The connections between the canonical resurrection narratives and GMary are not difficult to see. The GMary evangelist looked to fill in the gaps of what happened after the resurrection. In what sense or form did Jesus appear to Mary? What did he say to her? Why did the male disciples doubt her? In order to situate the answers provided, GMary may have included a brief resurrection account at the beginning of the text.

3.1.2. *The Location*

Perkins posits that revelation dialogues generally begin with a location: a mountain, Jerusalem and/or the Temple.[16] For GMary, the Temple can be ruled out almost immediately – the only Temple-based dialogue text that Perkins references is ApocPet_COP, which is not particularly comparable to GMary as it does not present Jesus as responding to questions from his disciples.[17]

---

[13] The Johannine motif of Mary's weeping (20.11, 13, 15) has been connected with her weeping in GMary (18,1). E.g. Tuckett, *Mary*, 17–18. However, that connection is tentative.

[14] Pasquier, *Marie*, 71; Silke Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit! Maria Magdalena, Salome and andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften*, NHMS 48 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 135; Tuckett, *Mary*, 170.

[15] Mary Rose D'Angelo, '"I Have Seen the Lord": Mary Magdalen as Visionary, Early Christian Prophecy, and the Context of John 20:14–18', in *Mariam, the Magdalen, and the Mother*, ed. Deirdre Good (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005), 112.

[16] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 42, 48. There is also the option of Jesus appearing inside a room as in Mark LE and John 20. Mark has the eleven disciples sitting at a table (16.14) when Jesus appears and John places the disciples behind locked doors (John 20.19, 26). The appearance of Jesus in ApJas could also be inside, as the disciples are sitting together writing the Saviour's teachings in books. However, James and Peter are then separated to an unknown location to receive the superior revelation. The Johannine connection is strong, but a mountain is more likely for the reasons given above.

[17] ApocPet_COP (NHC 7,3) is a dialogue between Christ and Peter, the night before Jesus' death. Peter has a vision of the crucifixion but asks what he is seeing and who it is that the authorities are arresting – clearly the Passion is not in his memory (dialogue gospels, on the whole, presuppose the Easter story). Luttikhuizen understands the revelation to be taking place simultaneously with the passion, Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, 'The Suffering Jesus and the Invulnerable Christ in the Gnostic Apocalypse of Peter', in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz, Studies on the Early Christian Apocrypha 7 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 190. The text is a dialogue but it is not a question-and-answer interchange.

A mountain is a much stronger contender for the location of GMary. Post-resurrection scenes that take place on a mountain are so common that some scholars suggest the mountain location is *typical* for Christian 'gnostic' resurrection appearances.[18] However, mountain locations are hardly reserved for 'gnostic' texts – the earliest account of this tradition is in Matt 28:

> Οἱ δὲ ἔνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν (28.16–17)
>
> And the eleven disciples journeyed into Galilee to the mountain that Jesus had directed them, and on seeing him they worshipped him; but some doubted.

The Matthean mountain signifies the high points of Jesus' career, including the great commission. Donaldson argues that the commission location ties together the previous mountain locations of temptation (4.8), teaching (5.1; 8.1), feeding (15.29), transfiguration (17.1–9) and the Olivet discourse (24.3).[19] It is thus not surprising to find it as an intertextual motif in early Christian literature. A mountain also features as the location of the Synoptic transfiguration scene, which is referenced in 2 Pet 1.18 explicitly as ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει.

Mountains in dialogue gospels are sites of teaching, revelation and commission; they can be in Jerusalem or Galilee. In ApJohn, John turns from temple to mountain, which King interprets as 'a spatial setting that metaphorically suggests one must turn away from worship of the lower false gods and from the things of the world in order to comprehend the truth'.[20] EpPetPhil, ApocPet, 1ApocJas and SophJesChr are all set on a named mountain. The first appearance in EpPetPhil has the disciples on 'the mountain which is (the) place of Olives' (ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲛⲓϫⲟⲉⲓⲧ), significant to the evangelist as it recalls the time 'when he [Jesus] was in the body' (ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉϥϩⲛ ⲥⲱⲙⲁ [ₙₕ𝒸 133,13–17]). ApocPet likewise

---

[18] Evans regards the typical location for 'gnostic' resurrection appearances to be the Mount of Olives. However, he notes that, 'the appearances of the Risen Christ can occur in different locations, e.g. the desert (Ap. John II, 1:19), during a walk (Thom. Cont. II, 138:3), or even on a boat dock (Acts Pet. 12 Apost. VI, 1:33–2:1)', Craig A. Evans, 'Jesus in Gnostic Literature', *Biblica* 62, no. 3 (1981): 408. Also, Francis T. Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', ed. John J. Collins, *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, *Semeia* 14 (1979), 125; Tuckett, *Mary*, 36.

[19] Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*, JSNTSupp 8 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).

[20] Karen L. King, *The Secret Revelation of John* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2006), 154.

has Jesus 'sitting on the Mount of Olives', engaging in dialogue with the disciples (1.1). Presumably these texts refer to the Mount of Olives near Jerusalem (as in Matt 21.1), although SophJesChr relocates it to Galilee ($_{BG}$ 79, 6–9). In 1ApocJas, James awaits Jesus' return on 'the mountain which is called Gaugēlan' (ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲱⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉ ⲅⲁⲩⲅⲏⲗⲁⲛ [$_{NHC}$ 30,19–20]), where the risen Jesus appears to him.

The appearance of Christ in SophJesChr is also particularly noteworthy for GMary. As was proposed, the short opening 'After he rose from the dead' may be comparable to GMary's beginning. Also, the group explicitly includes women. The location is specified:

> ⲙⲛⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲣⲉϥⲧⲱⲟⲩ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲛⲟⲟⲩⲥ
>
> ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲥⲁⲱϥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥϩⲓ̈ⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲗⲓⲗⲁⲓⲁ ϩⲙ
>
> ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲱⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲁⲛⲧⲏ ϩⲓ ⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲩⲁⲡⲟⲣⲓ ⲟⲩ̄ ($_{BG}$ 77,9–78,2)
>
> After he rose from the dead, his twelve disciples and seven women who were
>
> his disciples came to Galilee onto the mountain which is called Divination and
>
> Joy.[21]

'Divination and Joy' is differentiated from the mountain 'which is called (the) place of Olives, in Galilee' (ⲉⲧⲉⲱⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲁ ⲛ{ⲧ}ϫⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲡⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲧⲁⲗⲓⲗⲁⲓⲁ [$_{BG}$ 79,7–9]), where he taught them about the perfect flesh. A mountain in Galilee is shared not only with Matthew but also PistSoph (4.142 [369,8]).[22]

There are several other reasons to suggest that the location of GMary is a mountain. Firstly, the Saviour's final instructions are closely connected to the Matthean commission. As the location of the commission is significant, it is possible that the author of GMary shared this tradition. Secondly, the mountain is a place of announcing apostolic authority. Mark and Luke have Jesus choose the Twelve on a mountain (Mark 3.13–19; Luke 6.12–16) and the Markan version also anticipates the commission (Mark 3.14). Apostolic authority is a particular concern in GMary as the disciples debate whether Mary is to be trusted to teach the authentic words of Jesus. Mountain locations may reflect a new, or superior, choosing of key apostles. Thirdly, in Matthew, the eschatological discourse is set on the Mount of Olives, demonstrating that it is an appropriate location to impart eschatological revelation. In GMary

---

[21] The name of the mountain ⲙ̄ⲁⲛⲧⲏ ϩⲓ ⲣⲁⲱⲉ may be from μαντεία or could be ⲙⲁ ⲛ ⲧⲏ (place of harvest), Marvin Meyer and Madeleine Scopello, 'The Wisdom of Jesus Christ', in *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures: The International Edition* (New York: Harper Collins, 2007), 287 n.3.
[22] The appearance of Jesus in Book One is on the Mount of Olives (1.2 [4,13]).

a mountain is the most likely location for the appearance of the risen Christ, his commission to preach, and his revelation of eschatological realities.

3.1.3. *The Disciples*

With the location on a mountain in mind, one would naturally ask who was there and what were they doing. The end of page 6 will almost certainly have read a disciple's name and ⲡⲉⲝⲉ (insert name) ⲛⲁϥ ⲝⲉ. Considering the format of other dialogues, disciples usually take it in turns to ask questions and so, as Peter asks the following question, it may be suggested that it is another disciple who asks about the destruction of matter. Levi and Andrew are most likely among the named group of disciples in the dialogue. Mary may have played a role, as she does in DialSav, GThom, SophJesChr and PistSoph; however, it is also likely that, as she rises when the Saviour departs (in a Paraclete-type role), she was earlier in the background. In comparable dialogues, other named disciples asking Jesus questions are Philip, Matthew, Thomas, Mary and Bartholomew (SophJesChr); Matthew, Mary and Judas (DialSav); and Peter, Thomas, Philip and Judas (John FD). Small groups of disciples were common, and so it is possible that in GMary it is just Peter, Andrew and Levi in conversation with the Lord. However, this does not mean that a larger group of disciples were not onlookers.[23] We find this in SophJesChr, in which the Saviour appears to twelve disciples and seven women, as quoted above, but only five questioners are named.

There are also commonalities between the concerns of the disciples in gospel dialogues. Luttikhuizen argues that: 'A characteristic feature of Gnostic revelation dialogues is the account of the perplexities and the troubling questions of the recipients prior to the appearance of the heavenly revealer'.[24] Again, we meet SophJesChr, in which shortly before the appearance of the Saviour, the disciples are pondering the greater questions:[25]

---

[23] This may account for the use of 'all': Jesus says farewell to them 'all' (ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ [8,13]) and Mary greets them 'all' (ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ [9,13]). 'All' is used in SophJesChr (ᴮᴳ 79,13), EpPetPhil (ₙₕᴄ 140,17) and ApJas (1,24; 2,8; 2,27) to refer to the larger group of disciples. Furthermore, we find disciples or apostles asking questions collectively: e.g. SophJesChr (ᴮᴳ 102,7–14; 112,19–24), DialSav (126,5–8; 139,13–15). This is also possible in GMary.

[24] Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, 'The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues', *NovT* 30, no. 2 (1988): 158. He cites Zostrianos, SophJesChr, ApJohn, EpPetPhil and GMary as examples. Luttikhuizen builds on Perkins' suggestion that, before the appearance of the revealer-figure, the disciples are generally being persecuted, preaching or writing/discussing Jesus' words; Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 42.

[25] This may be in reference to debating Jesus' words, as in Perkins' typology.

ⲉⲩⲁⲡⲟⲣⲓ ⲟⲩ̄ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲧⲟⲓⲕⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲙⲛ ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ

ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ

ⲙ̄ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲓⲕⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ (ᴮᴳ 78,2–11)

They were puzzled about the underlying reality of all things and the plan of
salvation, and the holy providence, and the power of the authorities, (and)
about everything that the Savior was doing with them in the mystery of the
holy plan of salvation.

The disciples are ready to ask the Saviour their unanswered questions, and in GMary Peter
says that the Saviour has told them all things (7,10–11). It may be best to assume that the
disciples played a similar role to those in SophJesChr. In the rest of the text, the disciples are
not anonymous characters without personality; they are active interpreters of the Saviour's
words, and so it fits that they would be hoping to question Jesus before his final departure.

3.1.4. *The Appearance of the Saviour*

With Christ in a resurrected form, there are fewer restrictions on how he may have appeared.
As we saw in chapter two, in Mark 16.12 Jesus appears ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, which is probably
related to his unrecognizability in Luke 24.16 and John 20.15. In Luke 24.16 as in GJudas
33,18–21, Jesus appears in a different form in order to conceal his true identity.[26] Other
dialogue gospels, however, have Jesus appear in a different form to make him hyper-
recognizable – SophJesChr includes a luminous appearance, ApJohn narrates a polymorphic
christophany and EpAp depicts an entirely fleshly resurrected Christ.

The Saviour in GMary manifesting himself in a different form would be in keeping
with the extant gospel. Within the text itself, Jesus' terse exit, 'he departed' (ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ [9,5]),
leaves open a number of interpretations.[27] Also, Mary sees the Lord in a vision (9,10–12),[28]
and a vision means that the appearance of the revealer is not bound by the conventions of
flesh. Mary does not waver when she sees the Lord in a vision (10,14–15), which may signify

---

[26] Although, as noted in chapter two, the disciples not recognizing Jesus in Luke is not necessarily because Jesus
has appeared in a different form.
[27] See Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 145.
[28] The vision appears to have occurred on the same day that Mary tells Jesus about the vision; but the evangelist
provides no time frame (unless it is in pages 1–6). The vision could be pre- or post-resurrection, and Hartenstein
has persuaded King that it refers to a kind of transfiguration scene, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 130, 153;
King, *Mary*, 175. However, the strong connections to John 20 suggest a post-resurrection setting.

an unexpected form.[29] A new form, in both the vision and the opening dialogue, would highlight Jesus as resurrected Saviour, who brings open speech and soteriological revelation. Although this remains plausible at best, there are intra-textual reasons and compelling parallels from cognate contemporary texts.

3.1.5. *The Missing Dialogue*

One thing we can say with some level of certainty is that the Saviour had been engaged in dialogue for some time. Peter states, 'Since you have told us everything, say one other (thing) to us' (ϩⲱⲥ ⲁⲕⲧⲁⲙⲟⲛ ⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲭⲱ ⲙⲡⲓⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ [7,10–12]). As Jesus told Peter and his companions *everything*, we can expect a number of questions and answers before the beginning of page 7.[30]

Continuing with the comparative approach, the *kind* of questions may be deduced. At the extant beginning of GMary, the questions are 'will [Ma]tter be de[stroy]ed or not?' (ⲑ[ⲩ]ⲗⲏ ϭⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲟⲩⲱ[ϭ]ⲡ ⲭⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ [7,1–2]) and 'What is the sin of the wor[ld]?' (ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ [7,12]). The questions are concerned with the fate of the cosmos and the state of humanity. These two questions represent a certain *type* of interest. For lack of a better phrase, these are concerns of the 'bigger picture'. It could be said that they are 'cosmocentric' rather than christocentric. Other dialogue gospels share the focus on 'cosmocentricism': in DialSav, Judas asks what existed before creation (127,19–21) and the disciples of SophJesChr are looking for the plan of salvation (BG 80,1–3). Others, such as ApJas and John FD, are framed in a more christocentric way, with questions regarding Jesus, his Father and how the disciples relate to them, as discussed briefly in our comparison of John FD and ApJas in chapter two. A number of dialogue gospels are also concerned with Jesus' departure, and the questions and issues discussed are framed within the realization that the disciples' time with the

---

[29] It may also signify the mere fact that Mary thought that Jesus was dead.

[30] Questions are generally shorter than the Saviour's reply and would not have occupied more than a few lines. The Saviour's answer takes up the first 9 lines of page 7, with the hearing formula at the end. The Saviour's direct reply to Peter's two-line question is seven lines long (7,13–20) with an extension of the reply to another hearing formula (8,11). Sometimes, an answer can become a monologue. On average, there are 23 lines per page of the Coptic GMary, leaving 138 lines for pages 1–6. The only fully extant question is three lines in length, and it would seem that the previous question was around two. The Saviour's answers take up between seven lines (for the first) and 17 lines (for the second). If we permit three lines per question and 10 lines per answer, that would leave space for nine questions and answers, and for a short appearance narrative. Of course, this is highly speculative but it gives a suggestion of what the first pages once contained.

Saviour is almost over. As we have seen, this is the focus of John FD, ApJas and, in parts, 1ApocJas.

In GMary, a major concern is how to live in the absence of Jesus – how will the disciples preach and how will they be saved. The dialogue between Jesus and the disciples is not the complete revelation and leaves the disciples in distress. The text continues with Mary revealing the salvation of the Soul. Presumably the dialogue with Christ foreshadows the revelation of the Soul's ascent, especially in light of the parallelism between Matter dissolving and the Soul ascending, both returning to their origins. The questions from the disciples at the beginning of the gospel may have been both christocentric and cosmocentric, and in many places, these two are not easily distinguished.

As stated at the beginning, these suggestions are not meant to act as a reconstruction of the text. Intra-textual exegesis of GMary, as well as looking at the text within its genre, allows for speculations about the missing content at the gospel's beginning. For example, GMary's focus on eschatological teaching and mission might point to a mountain setting, and Mary's Paraclete-type role might suggest that she has not featured earlier in this text.

3.2. The Saviour's Farewell Discourse

Immediately prior to Jesus' departure, he gives a short, hortatory monologue, which we will call his farewell discourse (FD).[31] This monologue contains a dense quantity of material shared with the canonical gospels.[32] The concentration of direct canonical 'allusions' in this short speech is one of the text's most curious features. Whether the allusions demonstrate literary dependence has been contested. In 1982, Tuckett argued that the author had access to (at least) the post-redactional apocalyptic discourses of the synoptic gospels, concluding that '[t]here is virtually no evidence for the use of pre-synoptic sources'[33] – a theory he has maintained ever since.[34] King rejects this hypothesis, arguing that Tuckett made the usual but incorrect assumption that GMary was influenced by the canonical gospels.[35] King argues for five factors that would potentially suggest literary dependence: (1) citation; (2) ordering of

---

[31] The FD is quite separate from the preceding dialogue. Jesus' greeting highlights their division. See Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 143.

[32] All GMary exegetes agree that here 'there is a significant clustering of echoes or allusions to the canonical gospels'. See Tuckett, *Mary*, 57.

[33] Christopher M. Tuckett, 'Synoptic Tradition in Some Nag Hammadi and Related Texts', *VC* 36, no. 2 (1982): 180, 184.

[34] Tuckett, *Mary*, esp. 55–75.

[35] King, *Mary*, 93.

material; (3) narrative context; (4) citation formula; and (5) specific language. Applying these factors to GMary, she contends that '[i]t does not show a consistent pattern of similarity to any one source or set of sources known to us, whether in word for word citation, ordering of materials, context, or theological emphasis'.[36] Whether GMary knew these canonical texts in the form we have today might be an insoluble question, but it does seem that GMary had knowledge of traditions within the canonical gospels (and Pauline epistles), and was composed later than these texts. We will not ask further questions about direct dependence, but instead acknowledge intertextuality. Each intertextual link within GMary offers a new interpretation of the canonical language, grounded in the message of the later gospel. As Hartenstein writes, GMary's use of traditional material shows a high degree of exegetical artistry.[37]

The FD can be divided into three parts: the double-peace farewell; instructions for the individual; and instructions for the benefit of the community. Each section demonstrates new interpretations and formulations of well-known Jesus sayings. By exploring these interpretations, it is possible to further situate the evangelist's message in the context of emerging Christianity.

3.2.1. *The Double-Peace Farewell*

The first expression is a 'double-peace saying':

ογειρнни интﬨ ταειρнни ϫποc интﬨ (8,14–15)

Peace to you. My peace, acquire to you.

The peace greeting is common in early Christian literature, often in the context of a greeting from the resurrected Christ appearing to his disciples.[38] In GMary, however, ογειρнни интﬨ is meant as a farewell rather than a greeting.

---

[36] King, *Mary*, 114. Tuckett and King are the two main contenders in this debate. Perkins provides the brief suggestion that Mary knew a sayings collection, Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 134–35.

[37] 'M.E. verweist diese Verwendung traditionellen Materials zur Vermittlung eigener Inhalte auf ein hohes Maß an exegetischer Kunstfertigkeit', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 156.

[38] John 20.19, 21, 26, Luke 24.36, SophJesChr NHC 91,21–22 and EpPetPhil NHC 140,15–20 all share the post-resurrection setting. Due to these correlations, King suggests that the author of GMary may have expected her readers to understand the peace-saying to be set within this post-resurrection framework, King, *Mary*, 99. Hartenstein wonders whether Jesus is here repeating his greeting at the start of the gospel, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 144. However, this can only be speculative. On the frequent occurrence of the peace saying,

The closest parallel to the farewell double-peace saying is John 14.27: 'Peace I leave with you. My peace I give to you' (Εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν). The twofold structure of the saying with the repeated dative ὑμῖν and a possessive in the second clause (εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν) mirrors precisely the structure of the saying in GMary. Furthermore, in both gospels, the phrase commences a farewell with Jesus imparting instructions to be enacted in his absence, despite one being set pre-crucifixion and the other post-resurrection.

The purpose of the saying is also different in John FD and GMary FD. In GMary, the peace is based on the disciples actively receiving it. This point is best expressed in the second clause of GMary 8,15: 'my peace, *acquire* to you' (ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲭⲡⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄). ⲭⲡⲟⲋ is also used in Levi's instructions to put on the Perfect Man: 'let us be ashamed and put on the Perfect Man and *acquire* him for ourselves' (ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̄ϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ϯ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲭⲡⲟϥ ⲛⲁⲛ [18,15–17]). Acquiring the Perfect Man requires action. In contrast, the Sahidic John reads, 'Peace I *leave* to you. It is my peace that I *give* to you' (ϯⲕⲱ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲉ ϯϯ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ [14.27]). The verb ⲕⲱ equates to the Greek ἀφίημι and ϯ to δίδωμι. In the Johannine saying, Jesus is the active participant and the disciples the passive recipients of the leaving/giving. In GMary, the disciples must take action.

The reason for this may be related to the Paraclete, whose coming will follow the departure of Jesus.[39] John could allow the disciples to be passive recipients due to the promised arrival of an external agent. GMary's eschatological teaching, on the other hand, omits a future expectation of a divine spirit (and also the Parousia); Mary steps into a Paraclete-type role, comforting and teaching the others, and reminding them of the words of Jesus. The individual soul must make its own way to heaven, following Jesus by remembering his teachings. There is no external help yet to come – the disciples must figure it out for themselves.[40] It is not Jesus leaving or giving the peace, as in John; it is the disciples

---

particularly in contexts of war, relationships, Stoicism, death and eschatological hope, see Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 982. Fallon regards the peace greeting as a modification of a self-identification, common in gnostic apocalypses, Fallon, 'Gnostic Apocalypses', 129.

[39] Brown states that the peace is based on the promise of the Paraclete 'to be actualized on Easter night… It is the peace of being freed from sin and united to God, the only complete fulfilment of all our wants. This peace cannot be disturbed by Jesus' departure to the Father; for that return, his glorification, effects peace', Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1988), 78. Not everyone agrees with Brown's reading of John's Paraclete, see George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTMS 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), esp. 123–25.

[40] Cf. King's suggestion that the interiorizing of the peace is the startling twist that GMary offers, King, *Mary*, 99. She argues that the fundamental purpose of GMary is to instruct the disciples to turn inwards and thus the gospel 'emphasizes the interiority of the peace in a way that is missing in the other [gospel] accounts' (99).

actively receiving it. Throughout the gospel, they must be prepared to be active participants in the Saviour's message.

3.2.2. *Instructions to the Individual Disciples*

The next section of the FD is aimed at the individual disciple, and this can be split into three parts. First, a warning against those who attempt to deceive them; second, the knowledge of where to find the Son of Man; and third, the instruction to follow, seek and find him. This section has numerous intertextual links with the synoptic eschatological discourses but, to avoid overlap with the following chapter, they will only be briefly discussed here.

ⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲙⲡⲣ̅ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲣ̅ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓ̈ⲥⲁ ⲏ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉ

ⲙⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϣⲟⲡ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲉϩⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲥⲱϥ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲓⲛⲉ

ⲛ̅ⲥⲱϥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϭⲛ̅ⲧϥ (8,15–21)

Beware, do not allow anyone to lead you astray saying, 'Look in this
direction' or 'Look in this place'. For the Son of Man is within you. Follow
him. Those who seek him will find him.

The warning against being deceived is a theme of the synoptic eschatological discourses, for example:

βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου
λέγοντες, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν (Matt 24.4–5; cf.
Mark 13.5–6 // Luke 21.8)

Beware that no one leads you astray. For many will come in my name saying,
'I am the Messiah' and they will lead many astray.

The parallels within the synoptic gospels are relatively similar: the warning is always in the context of those who profess false teachings and often those who claim to be the messiah are

---

However, if the evangelist sought to emphasize the interiority of peace, it is peculiar that she was not more explicit. The Coptic ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ means nothing more than 'to you' in 'peace to you' and 'receive my peace to you'. It cannot be compared to 'the Son of Man exists *within you*' (ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϣⲟⲡ *ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ϩⲟⲩⲛ* [8,19]). There is no reason to read the 'peace' as particularly interiorized.

in view.[41] GMary's warning, on the other hand, is aimed at those who claim that the Son of Man is not within. This makes the language in GMary closer to another occurrence of the warning in Mark and Matthew:

τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Ἰδοὺ ὧδε ὁ Χριστός, ἤ, ὧδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε… ἐὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν, Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν, μὴ ἐξέλθητε: Ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. (Matt 24.23, 26–27; cf. Mark 13.21, 26)

Then if anyone says to you, 'Look, here is the Messiah or there he is,' do not believe it… So, if they say to you, 'Look he is in the wilderness,' do not go out. If they say, 'Look, he is in the inner rooms,' do not believe it. For as the lightning comes from the east and flashes as far as the west, so will be the coming of the Son of Man.

The proximity of the warning and the explanation of the Son of Man in Matthew/Mark is undeniably close to GMary.[42] However, the way in which these two gospels employ the warning clash. In Matthew, the warning directly refutes those who say the Messiah/Son of Man is anywhere in particular; rather, he will come as the lightning flashes. His coming is a future spectacle that will be manifest to everyone. In GMary, the warning is used to counter this exact idea: the Son of Man is already present, internal and therefore limited to disciples who follow him. The two evangelists move in opposite directions from a similar warning statement.

The third part of the instruction to the individual, to follow-seek-find, demonstrates further reformulation of traditional Jesus sayings. The command to follow reflects the numerous instances in gospel literature where Jesus meets a future disciple and says Ἀκολούθει μοι. In the canonical gospels, this command is often enacted by the literal following of Jesus across Galilee and Judea;[43] or refers to the conditions of discipleship (e.g. Matt 16.24 + pars). Tuckett argues that in GMary:

---

[41] A point of contrast is that Matthew's deceivers claim to be ὁ Χριστός (Matt 24.4) as opposed to Mark and Luke which just have Ἐγώ εἰμι (Mark 13.6 // Luke 21.8).

[42] Tuckett argues that '[i]t is uncertain how precise one should make any comparison here', and, in any case, the phrase in GMary is closer to Luke 17.23 'in being unspecific about the nature or identity of any false figures', Tuckett, *Mary*, 58–59.

[43] E.g. Matt 8.22, 9.9, 19.21; Mark 1.17, 2.14, 10.21; Luke 9.59, 5.27, 18.22; John 1.43.

> To 'follow the Son of Man' has been divorced from any relation to Christian
> discipleship in the sense of following in the way of the cross; rather, it has been
> radically internalized and 'spiritualized' in terms of a 'Gnostic' self-understanding
> and set of ideas and presuppositions.[44]

Although this interpretation is persuasive, it only accounts for part of the meaning of the text. GMary does not focus solely on turning inwards: internal spiritual achievement is a *prerequisite* for the external activity of preaching the gospel, and also for the Soul's eschatological journey to heaven. Pasquier interprets the instruction to follow in GMary as to take as a model.[45] Indeed, there are several examples of imitation throughout the gospel: Mary imitates Jesus in his words and actions (9,10–24); Mary also imitates the Soul in her silence (17,8); and Levi imitates both the words of Saviour's farewell discourse and Mary's actions (18,5–19,2). Furthermore, the disciples' Souls are to imitate Jesus' heavenly journey. GMary uses the command to 'follow' in a similar way to ApJas, in which it is found in an eschatological-soteriological context: 'I have commanded you to follow me, and I have taught you what to say before the archons' (ⲁϩⲓϣⲱⲛ ⲁⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ̄· ⲁⲧⲣⲉⲕⲟⲩⲁϩⲕ̄ ⲛⲥⲱⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲓⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉ ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲕ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲑⲩⲡⲟⲑⲉⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ [8,33–36]). Here, the disciples are instructed to *follow* the Lord to their place of heavenly origin.

It is also possible, though not certain, that Tuckett is wrong in saying that the command to follow has been divorced from the sense of following in the way of the cross. ApJas has the heavenly-earthly parallelism of persecution, also seen in 1ApocJas, and has often been read as an invitation to martyrdom.[46] Therefore, the invitation to follow reflects Jesus' words to Peter in John 21.19 (Ἀκολούθει μοι). Just before Jesus' death, he told Peter that he could not follow him now but that he would be able to afterward (13.36), despite Peter's protest that he would lay down his life for him (13.37). After Jesus' resurrection, Peter becomes the shepherd who must lay down his life for his flock (10.11 + 21.18–19). It is possible that the command to follow in GMary has a martyrdom connotation. Once Jesus departs, the disciples are anxious about undertaking his command to preach, asking, 'If they did not spare him, how will they spare us?' (ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩ†ⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲉⲩ

---

[44] Tuckett, *Mary*, 156.
[45] Pasquier, *Marie*, 62.
[46] David Brakke, 'Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James', *JECS* 7, no. 2 (1999): 205; Jacques van der Vliet, 'Spirit and Prophecy in the Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha (NHC I,2)', *VC* 44, no. 1 (1990): 25–53.

ⲛⲁϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ [9,10–12]). Mary comforts the disciples, explaining that Jesus' grace will protect them (9,16–18). She does not say what from. Perhaps to follow the Son of Man in GMary is to follow Jesus ascending into heaven, via the cross. Martyrdom may not be explicitly encouraged in GMary, but that does not disqualify it as an option.

The seek/find command is also common in early Christian gospels (e.g. GThom 2, 38, 59, 92; BookThom 140,42–141,2; cf. Matt 7.7 // Luke 11.9) and may have circulated as a freestanding saying.[47] The author of GMary uses it here in the same christological way as to 'follow'.[48] Those who seek Jesus within will find him, and this will ultimately lead the disciple to her eschatological Rest. However, seeking and finding the Son of Man within is also prerequisite for the penultimate instruction of the farewell discourse: to preach the gospel.

3.2.3. *Preach the Gospel but Do Not be Like the Lawgiver*

In the final section of the FD, Jesus exhorts the disciples to act for the benefit of the wider community.[49] The first part is a commission to preach; the second is an injunction against laying down extra rules.

The first instruction, 'Go then and preach the gospel of the kingdom' (ⲃⲱⲕ ϭⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ [8,21–22]), leads to the gospel's finale when the disciples (or Levi alone if reading PRyl.GM) depart to preach.[50] The command is clearly an important motif in early Christian texts and is comparable to Matt 28.19, as discussed in chapter two. GMary differs from Matthew in that we see the disciples' reaction to the commission:

---

[47] See Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 356–70.

[48] King contends that readers who were familiar with both GMary and alternative seeking and finding commands 'would not have understood them in terms of borrowing or influence, but as differing, even conflicting meanings of Jesus' command', King, *Mary*, 106.

[49] This goes against twentieth-century assumptions that so-called 'gnostic' texts focus on self-knowledge and show little concern for others as they have a world-negating or anti-social attitude. For discussion of this point, see Lance Jenott and Elaine Pagels, 'Antony's Letters and Nag Hammadi Codex I: Sources of Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt', *JECS* 18, no. 4 (2010): 557–589; Michel Robert Desjardins, *Sin in Valentinianism*, SBLDS 108 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

[50] De Boer believes that 'the main purpose of the Gospel of Mary is to encourage the disciples to go out and preach the gospel', de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 56–57.

ⲁⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙⲡϣⲁ ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ϣⲁ ⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ

ⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡϣ`ⲏ′ⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟϥ

ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ (9,6–12)

They wept much, saying, 'How shall we go to the nations and preach the gospel of the kingdom of the Son of Man? If they did not spare him, how will they spare us?'

In GMary, the mission anxiety is directed towards preaching to the 'nations', which has led Pasquier and Lührmann to see a direct connection with Matthew's use of ἔθνος both in the eschatological discourse (24.14) and the great commission (μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη [28.19]). They both see the use of ἔθνος as *polemical* against Matthew. Pasquier focuses on Matthew's Olivet discourse, which further connects to GMary through the unusual shared phrase 'the gospel of the kingdom':

καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος. (Matt 24.14)

And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the world, as a testimony to all the nations; and then the end will come.

She argues that Matt 24 and GMary FD share three elements, but these three elements are formulated in opposite sequence:

Matthew: Preach the gospel of the kingdom to all nations (24.14) → warning against error (24.23–26) → coming of the Son of Man (24.27).

GMary: Warning against error (8,15–18) → Son of Man within (8,18–19) → preach the gospel of the kingdom (8,21–22).

For Matthew, the preaching of the gospel leads to the coming of the Son of Man; in GMary, finding the Son of Man within is a condition of preaching the gospel.[51]

---

[51] Pasquier, *Marie*, 62. See also King, *Mary*, 108.

Lührmann, on the other hand, focuses on the Matthean resurrection scene, and specifically the instructions in 28.18–20, and the final instruction of the FD in GMary:

ⲙⲡⲣⲕⲁ ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲅⲟⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲅⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲟⲯ̄ϥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄† ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲑⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲁⲙⲁⲅⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲅⲏⲧϥ (8,22–9,4)

Do not lay down any rules beyond what I have appointed for you, nor give a law like the Lawgiver in case you be dominated by it.

The admonition is further stressed by its repetition at the end of the gospel:

ⲕ̣ⲁ̣ⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲅⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲕⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲅⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲕⲉⲅⲟⲣⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲕⲉⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲥⲱ̄ⲣ (18,17–21)

… as he commanded us. And we are to preach the gospel, not laying down other rules or another la[w] beyond that which the Saviour told us.

The stress on the importance of what Jesus has commanded them is shared with the Matthean commission:

διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν· (Matt 28.20)

… teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you.

Lührmann argues that the references to making new laws in GMary are a polemic against Matthew, in which Jesus appears as a law-giver and instructs the disciples to obey his laws.[52] Lührmann goes as far as to question whether GMary takes up the tradition of Levi becoming Matthew; and asks whether the real Matthew is here depicted as Levi, rejecting the gospel under his name.[53] The eschatology of GMary and of Matthew appear to be at odds, but the depiction of Jesus is not. Matthew's instruction regarding the laws is more positive than GMary's – it is what the disciples should do, as opposed to what they should not do. But both are about following Jesus' teachings. It might rather be said that the stress on the importance of what Jesus has commanded them is something that they have in common.

---

[52] Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 45–47.
[53] 'So wäre der wahre Matthäus, dargestellt als Levi, derjenige, der mit dem Evangelium unter seinem falschen Namen nichts zu tun haben will', Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 47.

In GMary, the ⲡⲁⲣⲁ clause in both passages above shows that the prohibition is aimed at rules/law *beyond* the Saviour's.[54] What constitutes these other rules and laws is a matter of disagreement: de Boer assumes that Peter and Andrew are following different laws to Mary about female prophets;[55] Schaberg sees GMary as comparing Peter's behaviour to 'that of heretical Christians or more likely that of the Powers… There are indeed rules or laws under the surface of what Peter has said, rules that "dominate" him';[56] Pagels assumes that this was written to combat the silencing of women, as seen in 1 Cor 14.33–35;[57] and King offers a setting of intra-Christian debate.[58]

The warning in GMary is aimed both at the creation of new rules and not following the Saviour's command. The imposition of new rules was clearly an issue in early Christian communities. As an example, the *Didache* proposes strict rules for fasting. The ὑποκριταί fast on Monday and Thursday, but the readers of the *Didache* should distinguish themselves from the hypocrites by fasting on Wednesday and Friday (8.1).[59] These rules clearly extend beyond Jesus' teachings and were being debated among early Christians. Ptolemy refutes those who practise fasting that has been prescribed for a particular day (*Ep. Flora* 33.5.13), and this could well be the kind of situation that GMary is warning against.

However, most interpreters agree that ὁ νομοθέτης is used to refer to Moses in GMary.[60] Although GMary does not appear particularly interested in Moses or the Jewish law, its placement alongside ApJohn in the Berlin Codex may account for the use of νομοθέτης language. ApJohn regards Moses' account of the history of humankind, as told in

---

[54] Cf. PRyl.GM 22. Discussed below.

[55] de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 206. The laws refer to women's inability to experience a direct relationship with God.

[56] Jane Schaberg, *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene: Legends, Apocrypha, and the Christian Testament* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004), 177; King, *Mary*, 53–56. The rules that Schaberg refers to are those of female oppression.

[57] In conversation with King, see King, *Mary*, 56 n.9. Tuckett argues that as 1 Cor 14.34–35 is probably a post-Pauline gloss, the author of GMary would have been unaware of it, Tuckett, *Mary*, 159 n.84. But the author of GMary would have been aware of the sort of argument that shaped 1 Cor 14.33–35.

[58] King, *Mary*, 54.

[59] See Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998), 132.

[60] Lampe gives five options for ὁ νομοθέτης: God, Christ, Moses, Paul or church leaders, G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 919b. On the 'Lawgiver' being Moses in GMary, see King, *Mary*, 53; Pasquier, *Marie*, 64; Michel Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984), 229. Tuckett writes that it unclear whether the Lawgiver in GMary is Moses himself or the demiurge of the Hebrew Bible, Tuckett, *Mary*, 158. *Contra,* Hartenstein argues that the Lawgiver is Jesus as he refers to laws that he has appointed. She separates the instruction to the disciples into two prohibitions: (1) Jesus' instructions are not meant to be supplemented or abolished, and (2) to act like the Lawgiver may dominate the disciples. The domination by these new laws is mirrored to being dominated by the powers, and what they try to do to the Soul. The disciples must not act like Jesus, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 145.

Genesis, as incorrect. Teaching laws outside of God's, with Moses as the νομοθέτης, is a concern for Ptolemy, who teaches Flora that the law is defective. Ptolemy argues that the Lawgiver (ὁ νομοθέτης) cannot be the perfect God as the law still needs to be fulfilled by the Saviour;[61] but nor can the Lawgiver be the devil as the law abolishes injustice. In the first instance, the Lawgiver is the demiurge or the 'god of Justice' (3.6–7, 7.5).[62] The law is subdivided into three commandments that are good (the decalogue), unjust (an eye for an eye), and symbolic (rituals) (33.5). However, the law in the Pentateuch had multiple authors, and some of its commandments were established by human beings (4.1). Ptolemy argues that Moses created laws outside of God's and is thus himself a Lawgiver:

> Διαλεγόμενός που ὁ σωτὴρ πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τοῦ ἀποστασίου συζητοῦντας αὐτῷ, ὅ δὴ ἀποστάσιον ἐξεῖναι νενομοθέτητο. ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μωυσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. Θεὸς γάρ, φησί, συνέζευξε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν, καὶ ὅ συνέζευξεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος, ἔφη, μὴ χωριζέτω. Ἐνταῦθα ἕτερον μὲν < τὸν > τοῦ θεοῦ δείκνυσι νόμον, τὸν κωλύοντα χωρίζεσθαι γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν τοῦ Μωυσέως, τὸν διὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ἐπιτρέποντα χωρίζεσθαι τοῦτο τὸ ζεῦγος. Καὶ δὴ κατὰ τοῦτο ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ νομοθετεῖ ὁ Μωυσῆς · ἐναντίον γάρ ἐστι < τὸ διαζευγνύναι >. (4.4–6).
>
> When the Saviour was talking with those who were arguing with him about divorce – and it has been ordained (νενομοθέτητο) that divorce is permitted – he said to them: 'For of your hardness of heart Moses allowed divorce of one's wife. Now, from the beginning it was not so.' For God, he says, has joined together this union, and 'what the Lord joined together, let no man dissolve'. Here he shows that (the) law of God is one thing, forbidding a woman to be divorced from her husband, while the law of Moses is another, permitting the dissolving of the union because of hard-heartedness. So, Moses laid down (νομοθετεῖ) a law contrary to that of God, for separating is contrary to not separating.[63]

Ptolemy has a relatively neutral view of the demiurge and Moses as Lawgivers. He writes that Moses only created laws outside of God's as a lesser of two evils.

GMary has a much more negative view of creating laws that deviate from the Saviour's commands than Ptolemy does of Moses creating laws outside of his God's. Although GMary does not necessarily have to be referring to the Jewish law, the gospel shares Ptolemy's view that only the Saviour's law is perfect.[64] GMary uses the traditional νομοθέτης language but uses it to refer to community rules, possibly such as visions and female authority. There is evidence later in the gospel that Peter and Andrew have become dominated by these new rules as they declare Mary's revelation as heresy.

Through the reformulation of traditional Jesus sayings, the FD generates a new interpretation of the resurrected Christ. At points, his message is different from other gospel literature but at other points it is recognizably the same. The Saviour in the FD teaches the message of GMary: the disciples must play an active role; they are warned against an apocalyptic Son of Man; invited to achieve spiritual enlightenment as a prerequisite for preaching the gospel; and banned from creating new laws for the community.

3.3. Mary's Intervention

Mary is characterized as a visionary, a teacher and, to some extent, a Paraclete. The evangelist underpins her exalted status as the Saviour calls her 'blessed' (ⲛⲁⲓ̈ⲁⲧⲉ [10,14]) and Peter says, 'Sister, we know that the Saviour loved you more than the other women' (ⲧⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱ̄ⲣ ⲟⲩⲁϣⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲕⲉⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ̄ϩⲓⲙⲉ [10,1–3]).[65] In many ways she is recognizably the Mary Magdalene of other gospel literature, but she has been developed and interpreted in new ways. Her exalted status mirrors her role as disciple, visionary and dialogue participant in John 20, GThom, SophJesChr, PistSoph and DialSav. In GThom and SophJesChr, she asks about discipleship and knowledge (GThom 21; SophJesChr NHC 98,9–11, 114,8–12). In DialSav she is one of the three disciples to gain special knowledge and

---

Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions (Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 306–15.

[64] *Contra*, Tuckett suggests that it is easier to 'see here part of the general polemic employed by some Gnostics against the "orthodox" that the latter are too dependent on, and use too much, the Jewish Law and its demands', Tuckett, *Mary*, 160.

[65] The issue of Mary's gender has been studied extensively and will not be discussed here. For my thoughts on the matter, see Sarah Parkhouse, 'The Fetishization of Female Exempla: Mary, Thecla, Perpetua and Felicitas', *NTS* 63, no. 4 (2017): 567–87.

instruction. In PistSoph she is able to quote Isaiah, Psalms, Jesus and Paul[66] and similarly in DialSav she quotes Jesus (139,8–11). She is called 'a woman who knew all things' (cϩιμε εαcειμε επτηρϥ̅ [DialSav 139,12–13]).[67]

In GMary, Mary's status changes slightly between the Coptic and Greek versions, especially with regard to her relationship with the male disciples – they are only small changes, but enough to make a difference. This is what we will explore here.

3.3.1. *Mary and the Men*

The Greek and Coptic recensions of GMary show instability in Mary's relationship with the male disciples, Peter, Andrew and Levi. We find the first substantial difference between the Greek and Coptic MSS at the point when Mary arises:

τοτε αμαριϩαμ τωογν αcαπαζε μμοογ τηρογ (9,12–14)
Then Mary rose, she greeted them all…

[τοτε αναστασα Μαρι αμμη και ασπαζομενη α]υτους κατεφιλησε [αυτους]…
(POxy.GM 8–9)
[Then Mary rising and greeting th]em, kissed [them…

The Greek verbs ἀσπαζομένη (reconstructed) and κατεφίλησε correspond to the single verb αcπαζε in Coptic. It is debated whether POxy.GM ever read ἀσπαζομένη and κατεφίλησε: Lührmann and Tuckett suggest that two verbs match the spacing of the missing part of the MS;[68] however, Parsons disagrees, suggesting that the line would have read: τότε ἀναστᾶσα Μαριάμμη αὐτοὺς κατεφίλησε with αcπαζε replacing κατεφίλησε in the Coptic translation.[69]

---

[66] 1.18 [26,21–27.19]; 1.60 [119,5–12]; 1.62 [123,11–14]; 3.113 [293,18–294,1]. In PistSoph, she is also called 'blessed among all women on earth' (1.19 [28,21–22]) and 'blessed by all generations' (1.34 [56,11–13]). Because of these titles, Shoemaker argues that this Mary is Mary Jesus' mother, Shoemaker, 'Rethinking the "Gnostic Mary"', 572–73. Brock, however, examines all of the unidentified Marys in PistSoph and argues that they are all Mary Magdalene, Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 47. Marjanen and de Boer agree with this identification; Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 173–74; de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 18.
[67] Mary also has an active role in EpAp, GPhil and GPet, among others.
[68] Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 109; Tuckett, *Mary*, 110.
[69] P. J. Parsons, '3525: Gospel of Mary', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs, Vol. 50 70 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 13–14.

Whether the Greek MS read ἀσπαζομένη is unimportant; the significance is in the translation, assimilation, replacement or deletion of καταφιλέω in the Coptic MS.

It is unlikely that κατεφίλησε has simply been *translated* as ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ. In the Sahidic NT καταφιλέω is always translated as ϯⲡⲓ,[70] suggesting that the translator of GMary would not naturally have chosen ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ for καταφιλέω.[71] Till and Mohri propose that the two verbs were *assimilated*: the word ἀσπαζομένη may have included a kiss of greeting and so ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ is simply an abbreviation of the longer ἀσπαζομένη and κατεφίλησε.[72] However, Tuckett rightly questions why then POxy.GM would have used both verbs, since by doing so it indicates that 'the "kissing" is something additional to a more general "greeting"'.[73]

It seems, then, that the Coptic translator/scribe is purposefully *replacing* or *deleting* κατεφίλησε. The question is why? In King's earlier work on GMary she suggests that the reference to kissing was excluded from the Coptic text as 'the practice of exchanging chaste kisses had come into disrepute in the later Egyptian Christian circles which produced the Coptic version'.[74] Although she does not cite him, Clement supports King's claim as he worries about the holy kiss being turned into a shameless act (*Paed.* 3.11.81). The concern over sexual indecorum is a plausible reason; however, in the NT καταφιλέω never suggests a sexual relationship and it is improbable that this is the primary concern here.

Rather than solely sexual indecency, the issue is also likely to be theological indecency. In Penn's extensive study of kissing Christians, he shows that the kiss was used as a symbol of Christian unity and community. Christians could only kiss fellow Christians and were prohibited from exchanging a kiss with potential heretics.[75] This is likely to be in the background of GMary; the Coptic scribe/translator would not accept Mary kissing Peter and

---

[70] E.g. a son kissing a father (Luke 15.20), the kissing of Jesus' feet (Luke 7.38, 45), and Judas' kiss (Matt 26.48–49; Mark 14.45).

[71] Further confusion arises from the English translation of GPhil. Exegetes and translators generally regard ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ as kiss, with Jesus kissing his companion (κοινωνος), Mary Magdalene on her… (63,32–36). The sentence ends with a lacuna but is usually reconstructed as mouth (ⲣⲟ). For example: R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip: Translated from the Coptic Text, with an Introduction and Commentary* (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co, 1962); Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 145–47; Paul Foster, 'The Gospel of Philip', in *The Non-Canonical Gospels*, ed. Paul Foster (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 75; Karen L. King, 'The Place of the Gospel of Philip in the Context of Early Christian Claims about Jesus' Marital Status', *NTS* 59, no. 4 (2013): 578. The translation 'kiss' is based on the ⲧⲉⲥ- (her) and the assumption that the first word in the lacuna that follows was probably ⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ 'mouth'. But this would be an uncommon use of the word ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ.

[72] Till, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, 338; Erika Mohri, *Maria Magdalena: Frauenbilder in Evangelientexten des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts*, Marburger theologische Studien 63 (Marburg: Elwert, 2000), 262.

[73] Tuckett, *Mary*, 121. He does not note this, but the kiss is a form of greeting: 'Greet each other with a holy kiss' (ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲉⲣⲏⲩ ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲡⲓ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ [Rom 16.16; 1 Cor 16.20; 2 Cor 13.12]).

[74] King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', 630 n.4.

[75] Michael Philip Penn, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

Andrew as they do not belong to the same community. Andrew essentially declares her a heretic when he says 'I myself do not believe that the Saviour said such things, for surely these are alien teachings' (ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲙⲉⲛ ϯⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲁⲡⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲥⲃⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ [17,13–15]). The omission of κατεφίλησε heightens the sense of disunity within the group of disciples.

The idea of disunity is found throughout the Coptic text, especially in relation to the Greek fragments. Another example is in Mary's words:

ⲁϥⲥⲃ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁϥⲁⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ (9,19–20)
he has prepared us, he has made us Men

συνήρτηκεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ⲁⲛⲟ[ⲩⲥ πεποίηκεν] (POxy.GM 12)
he has united us and [has made us M]en

In POxy.GM, συναρτάω has the sense of the disciples being joined or 'knit together' as one.[76] It is possible that it refers to elements of the individual being joined together into a Perfect Man, but it can also be read as the group of Christians being joined together into a holy community (cf. Eph 4.16, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον...). In contrast, ⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ (prepared) in the Coptic has no sense of group identity and pertains instead to the individual. Although these differences are slight, they are not negligible.

In both the Greek and Coptic versions, the male disciples recognize Mary's superior knowledge and close relationship with the Saviour before she reveals it. It is Peter who requests that she tells them what she knows; however, the words again differ slightly between BG and POxy.GM:

ϫⲱ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲧⲙ̄ⲟ̒ⲩ ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ϯⲛⲁⲧⲁⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟϥ (10,4–9)

---

[76] The sense of cohesion that συναρτάω implies can be seen through its use in Hippocrates: ἡ ἄνω γνάθος … συνήρτηται τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ οὐ διήρθρωται (the upper jaw is joined to the head and is not easily broken). Another example is συνηρτημέναι [ἀρεταὶ] τοῖς πάθεσι ([virtues] are joined to the passions) (Aristotle). For these examples and more, see Liddell, Scott, and Jones, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1843; 9th ed., 1940), 1699.

'Tell us the words of the Saviour that you remember, those that you know and we do not, nor have we heard them.' Mary answered and said, 'What is hidden from you, I will proclaim to you'.

ειπον ουν ημειν ο[σους συ γινωσκεις λογο]υ̣ς του σωτηρος [ους] η̣μ̣ει̣ς ουκ ηκουσαμε̣ν̣ υπε̣[λαβε Μαριαμμη λεγουσα οσα υμ]α̣ς λανθανει και απομνημονευω α̣γ̣α̣[γγελω υμιν] (POxy.GM 16–18)

Tell us [those words that you know] of the Saviour [which] we have not heard.' [Mary answered, saying, 'What is] unknown to you and I remember, I will pr[oclaim to you'.]

In both recensions, Peter is perfectly willing to acknowledge that the Saviour gave a private revelation to Mary. We might expect an element of bravado from Peter, unwilling to accept that a woman could possess hidden knowledge; however, the text shows no hint of any… yet. However, the reason that the teaching is unknown to the male disciples has stronger negative connotations in the Coptic. ϩⲏⲡ suggests that the words of the Saviour were *hidden* from the disciples. Tuckett does not regard this variation as significant;[77] however, according to King, '[i]n the Coptic version, Mary really rubs it in: she says that she has the teaching that has been *hidden* from them... because the Savior singled her out'.[78] Although ϩⲏⲡ can be translated from λανθάνω, it is more commonly used for κρύπτω in the Sahidic NT, and so it is more likely to have a sense of concealment than simply escaping notice.[79] There appears to be a Coptic scribe/translator at work highlighting the unworthiness of Peter and his companions in comparison with Mary.

3.3.2. '*Verkörperung*' or Paraclete?

The language used to depict Mary's relationship with the Saviour is different in the Greek and Coptic:

---

[77] Tuckett, *Mary*, 123.
[78] King, *Mary*, 84.
[79] M. Wilmet, *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique, II. Les mots autochtones, 3*, CSCO 185 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1959), 1462a.

ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲥⲱⲣ ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ (17,8–9)

as the Saviour had spoken *with her* to this point.

ως του σωτηρος μεχρι ωδε ειρηκοτος (PRyl.GM 21,4–5)

as the Saviour had spoken to this point.

Lührmann regards these versions as radically different due to the Coptic addition of ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ, showing that the Saviour and Mary spoke *with each other*. He argues that the Greek, conversely, implies that the Saviour had been speaking in and through her, making Mary a 'Verkörperung' of the Saviour.[80] Tuckett questions this proposal:

> [W]hether… Mary is a 'Verkörperung' ('embodiment') of the Saviour is not so certain. Whilst there is no question that, in a number of important respects, Mary takes on the role of the Saviour, nevertheless here Mary can be seen as simply the vehicle through whom the words of the Saviour are transmitted to others via the report of her dream. It may then be going a little too far to suggest that the Coptic text has 'reduced' Mary's significance.[81]

At no point does the gospel indicate that Mary has *become* the Saviour: she is in dialogue with him, imitates him and, in some respects, replaces him. In all likelihood, this textual variation is an addition to aid the narrative rather than demonstrating any theological significance.

Mary does not become Jesus, but she does replace him. Mary rises as Jesus departs. As Mary stands and speaks to the other disciples, her voice is elided with that of the Saviour and she takes a position analogous to him. She becomes their consoler, comforter and encourager, allaying their fears about mission and turning their minds towards the Good (9,12–22). For these reasons, Petersen suggests that Mary fulfils the role of the Johannine Paraclete:

> Dabei erfüllt Maria die Rolle, die im Joh für den Parakleten angekundigt ist: Sie tröstet und ermutigt die JüngerInnen und erinnert sie an Jesu Worte. Sie verkündigt

---

[80] Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 187. Also, Mohri, *Maria Magdalena*, 263.
[81] Tuckett, *Mary*, 186–87.

den JüngerInnen nicht ihre eigenen Ideen, sondern das, was sie von Jesus gehört hat. Und durch ihre Vermittlung werden sie über das Kommende, nämlich den Aufstieg der Seele belehrt. Die Lehre vom Seelenaufstieg könnte für das EvMar durchaus auch als 'ganze Wahrheit' bezeichnet werden; Maria vermittelt hier einen zentralen Inhalt gnostischer Theologie.[82]

Indeed, there are many similarities between the Paraclete in John FD and Mary in GMary:

The Paraclete will come as Jesus departs (15.26; 16.7, 8, 13);	Mary rises as the Saviour departs (9,5–12);
the disciples can recognize the Paraclete (14.17);	true disciples, such as Levi, recognize Mary's status (18,10–15);
the world neither sees nor recognizes the Paraclete (14.17);	The world, perhaps represented here by Peter and Andrew, does not recognize or accept Mary (17,11–17);
the Paraclete will teach the disciples everything (14.26); and the things to come (16.13)	Mary teaches the disciples what they do not know; and of the things to come (10,7–17,9);
will glorify Jesus (16.14);	Mary glorifies the Saviour (9,18–19);
will bear witness on Jesus' behalf (15.26);	Mary bears witness once the Saviour has departed (9,12–20);
will remind the disciples of all that Jesus told them (14.26);	Mary reminds the disciples that which the Saviour told her (10,4–9);
and will speak only what he hears and nothing on his own (16.13).	Mary only speaks what she has heard and nothing on her own (17,7–9).

I want to draw attention to three points in particular. In John, the Paraclete will come as Jesus departs. In GMary, the use of ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ (arose) in describing Mary's 'entrance' suggests that she only comes to the fore after Jesus departs. In both texts, the two revealers are in tandem. The second point, that Mary *reminds* the disciples of the Saviour's words, is clear through the

---

[82] Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit*, 141. Schaberg simply says that Mary is 'much like the Paraclete', Schaberg, *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene*, 172.

short dialogue between her and Peter (although slightly different in the Greek and Coptic versions, as discussed above). John insists that the Paraclete teaches nothing new, but does not simply recall the past. As Brown writes, 'the Paraclete played an interpretative role – making what Jesus had said and done relevant and meaningful to succeeding generations'.[83] Mary recalls only what the Saviour said to her, and makes it relevant for the disciples after his departure, although they do not all agree with it. The third point, that Mary only tells the others what she has heard from the Saviour, is so strongly demonstrated that she remains 'silent *because* (or: as) the Saviour had spoken with her to this point' (ⲁⲥⲕⲁⲣⲱⲥ ⲅⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲥⲱ̄ⲣ ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ [17,8–9]).

Furthermore, in John the Paraclete is said to 'declare to you the things that are to come' (τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν [16.13]). Mary's teaching is eschatological – she reveals the ascent of the Soul. With this connection in mind, there is a new possible reconstruction of a verb in POxy.GM. Tuckett follows Parsons in reconstructing ἀπαγγέλω in [οσα υμ]ας λανθανει και απομνημονευω απα[γγελω υμιν] (POxy.GM 18).[84] But he notes that the first three letters are 'very uncertain'.[85] The verb ἀναγγέλλω (to announce, make manifest, unveil), is used for the Paraclete in John 16.13, as well as occurring in apocalyptic literature in the sense of unveiling the truth of a vision.[86] It is therefore plausible that this is the verb in POxy.GM.[87]

It is not to be argued that Mary is the *equivalent* of the Johannine Paraclete. There are, of course, differences between the two. Tuckett dismisses the connection outright, writing:

> [T]he roles of the two figures in the respective texts, and the relationship of each figure to Jesus, differ significantly. Thus the reminding function of the Paraclete seems to relate more to a recalling of things already known (cf. John 14.26), not mediating new teaching (as Mary does in her vision and to which Andrew and Peter object). So too there is no idea of Jesus 'sending' Mary 'from the Father' as the Paraclete will be 'sent' by Jesus (John 15.26). Conversely, there is no mention in John of a relationship of love between Jesus and the Paraclete.[88]

---

[83] Raymond E. Brown, 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 13, no. 2 (1967): 129.
[84] Parsons, '3525: Gospel of Mary'; Tuckett, *Mary*, 108.
[85] Tuckett, *Mary*, 111.
[86] E.g. Dan 5.12,15; 9.23; 10.21; 11.2 Theod; cf. Isa 46.10.
[87] See Brown, 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel', 121. Furthermore, Crum has ἀναγγέλλειν for ⲧⲁⲙⲟ, W. E Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939), 413b.
[88] Tuckett, *Mary*, 192 n.210.

These are valid objections.[89] Indeed, there are further objections to be made against equating Mary to the Johannine Paraclete; for example Mary does not seem hostile to the world nor does she put the world on trial.[90] Also, in John, the Paraclete 'represents Jesus and has no independent existence of his own… he is Jesus' Doppelgänger or double, his alter ego'.[91] This is not true of Mary. And, she is not the spirit of truth (although she declares truths) nor the holy spirit (although she is blessed).

But the idea of the Paraclete was not always understood strictly in the Johannine sense – it was being reinterpreted by other Christian authors, and this might be what we see in GMary. The Valentinians embraced the idea of the παράκλητος, usually identifying it with Christ,[92] and the term Paraclete is used in ApJas, probably referring to Jesus: 'Woe to you who lack a Paraclete' (ογλει νητⲛ̅ ω νετⲱⲁⲁⲧ· ⲛ̅ⲛογⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲗⲏⲧⲟⲥ· [11,11–13]). Mani declared himself a new incarnation of the Paraclete, and *2 Clement* 6.9 uses the term in a general sense.[93] In 1ApocJas, once Jesus departs (for the first time), James is called a 'comfort' (ⲥⲟⲗⲥⲓⲗ̅ [CT 17,13]) and described as a 'second teacher' (ⲡⲙⲉⲣⲥⲁⲝ̅ ⲥⲛⲉγ [CT 17,14–15]), with his own disciples. 'Comfort' and Paraclete are closely related.[94] For GMary, if we interpret 'Paraclete' as a 'comforter' who reminds the disciples of the Saviour's teachings after his departure, Mary fits this role perfectly.

3.4. The Breach and Its Healing

In GMary, the four disciples play specific roles: Mary is a teacher, visionary and comforter; Andrew is the champion of, for lack of a better word, 'conventional' teachings; Peter defends male authority and open revelation; and Levi supports Mary and reminds them all of the Saviour's words. It could be said that the four characters exist on three levels, with Peter and

---

[89] However, it is quite possible that in the missing pages Jesus sent Mary to the brothers to teach them about the ascent of the soul. The narratival connections to John 20 have been noted, and in John 20.17, Jesus sends Mary to her brothers to tell them that Jesus is ascending.

[90] As Brown states for the Johannine Paraclete, Brown, 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel', 114.

[91] John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 442.

[92] *Exc. Theod.* 23.1–12; *Adv. Haer.* 1.4.3.

[93] 'Or who will serve as our advocate (ἡμῶν παράκλητος), if we are not found doing what is holy and upright?' Bart D. Ehrman, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers*, LOEB 24 (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003), 174–75.

[94] Davies argued that the primary function of the term παράκλητος is 'comforter' based on its LXX background of παρακαλεῖν, a verb that John never uses. See J. G. Davies, 'The Primary Meaning of Παράκλητος', *JTS* 4, no. 1 (1953): 35–38. *Contra*, '[W]hile "Comforter" is not an adequate translation, it does throw light on a facet of the Paraclete's role', Brown, 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel', 118.

Andrew representing lower, unenlightened followers of Jesus, Mary as having achieved a higher spiritual understanding, and Levi as something halfway: he understands that they should listen to Mary and be focused on the Saviour, but he does not possess the knowledge that Mary does.[95]

GMary tells a dramatic story. The disciples do not simply follow the teachings of the Saviour; instead they fall out over them. The Saviour's departure is followed by accusations of lying, female insubordination, weeping and reprimand. Mary's leadership role is not accepted by Peter and Andrew, and Peter's criticism of Mary is not accepted by Levi. The three primary objections of Peter and Andrew are novel and/or strange teachings, secret teachings and female authority, and these will be discussed here in turn.

3.4.1. *Strange Teachings*

As Mary falls silent, Andrew and Peter jump to attack her on the basis of the unfamiliarity of the revelation:

ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲁⲛⲇⲣⲉⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁϫⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥϫ[ⲟ]ⲟⲩ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲙⲉⲛ ϯⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲁⲡⲥⲱⲣ̄ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲥⲃⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ϩⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲉⲓϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ (17,10–17) Andrew answered and said to the brothers, 'Say whatever you say about what she said. I myself do not believe that the Saviour said such things, for surely these are alien teachings'. Peter answered, he spoke such matters.

ϩⲛⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ literally means 'in other thoughts', but 'alien' or 'heretical' are better translations. In PRyl.GM the word is [ⲉⲧⲉ]ⲣⲟⲅⲛⲱⲙⲟⲛⲉⲓⲛ (21,9–10), and the ετερο- prefix signifies *hetero*doxy.[96] ἕτερο- in 1 Tim 1.3 (ἵνα παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν) corresponds to -ⲕⲉ- (ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ϯⲕⲉⲥⲃⲱ), and so the ⲕⲉ in GMary represents 'false', not just 'other'. The first challenge to Mary is based on what was said, rather than who said it. Mary's revelation was her vision of the Lord in which he taught her about the ascent of the Soul, among other things (there are four missing pages). This individual eschatological journey is distinct from

---

[95] This has possible allusions to the tripartite division of humanity in the Valentinian system, but this would require a much longer study.
[96] The prefix is used in words that denote teaching false doctrines, for example ἑτεροδιδασκαλία and ἑτεροδοξέω; see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 552b.

the cosmic eschatology that the Saviour revealed in the dialogue of page seven, and unknown to Jesus traditions which were to become canonical. Mary is essentially preaching a *different gospel* to the one they are familiar with, and one that they claim is false.

Andrew's objection to this revelation is also found in PistSoph, in which Andrew cannot accept the teaching of the ascent of the Soul.

> ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲓⲣϣⲡⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓ̈ⲑⲁⲩⲙⲁⲍⲉ ⲉⲙⲁϣⲟ · ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓ̈ϩⲩⲗⲏ ⲡⲱⲥ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲉⲓ̓ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲓ̈ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲧⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓ̈ⲥⲧⲉⲣⲉⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲛⲉⲓ̈ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ... ⲡⲉⲓ̈ϩⲱⲃ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϥⲙⲟⲕϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ (2.100 [248,4–8, 13–14])
>
> My Lord, I am astonished and marvel greatly that when humankind who are in the world and in the body of this matter come forth (from) this world, they will surpass these firmaments and all these archons… This fact now, my Lord, is difficult for me.

Jesus' reaction is one of annoyance, asking how long he must suffer the ignorance of his disciples. After Jesus repeats the teaching, Andrew understands, and the other disciples ask the Lord to forgive Andrew's ignorance – which he grants. The fact that Andrew comes to understanding in PistSoph may give us a clue as to the end of GMary.

In GMary, Peter and Andrew are further able to challenge Mary's teaching about the Soul, due to the visionary nature of the revelation. She might just be making it up. Along with prophecy, ecstasy and dreams, visions were part of the ongoing philosophical debate concerning authority.[97] There were acceptable modes of prophesying associated with rationality – otherwise, it was considered madness.[98] Visions were not always thought of as true teaching and, conversely, they had the potential to question the value of apostolic authority as they revealed new truths. Mary is well aware of what she is accused of, answering: 'My brother Peter, what do you think then? Do you think that I am thinking of these (things) myself in my heart, or that I am lying about the Saviour?' (ⲡⲁⲥⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ ϩⲓⲉ ⲉⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲧ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲁϩⲏⲧ ⲏ ⲉⲉⲓϫⲓ ϭⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲣ [18,2–5]). She basically asks whether Peter thinks she is mad or bad.

---

[97] King argues that in early Christianity, in the majority of cases, female leadership was based on a woman's prophetic abilities. See Karen L. King, 'Prophetic Power and Women's Authority: The Case of the Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)', in *Women Preachers and Prophets Through Two Millennia of Christianity*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker (Berkeley and LA, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 21–41.

[98] See Laura Salah Nasrallah, *An Ecstasy of Folly: Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*, HTS 52 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Christine Trevett, 'Prophets, Economics, and the Rites of Man', in *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity*, ed. Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 43–64.

The gospel shows Mary as a true prophet. The Saviour himself praises Mary's stability (ⲛⲧⲉⲕⲓⲙ ⲁⲛ [10,14]), which shows her advanced spiritual ability in the face of the divine. Often in early Christian literature, appearances of the divine resulted in fear and the recipients falling or wavering;[99] however, the condition of stability was seen as part of the unchanging spiritual realm, to which Mary belongs.[100] After revealing her vision, Levi recognizes that the Saviour thought her to be worthy (18,11).

Andrew and Peter's challenge may suggest that the gospel was written in a milieu that understood its marginality in relation to those who followed 'conventional' teachings. Many scholars place the gospel in this context, arguing that the debate between Mary and Peter signifies a larger debate between orthodox and 'gnostic' Christianity.[101] The phrase ⲅⲛⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ demonstrates the evangelist's self-awareness that this gospel proposes a different interpretation of Jesus' teachings, whilst engaging with ongoing questions of true and false revelation.[102]

3.4.2. *Secret Teachings*

Peter's objection is not just against the strangeness of the teachings, but also Mary's gender and the secrecy of the revelation.

> ⲁϥϫⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲁϥϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲛϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲛ
> <ⲟⲩ>ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲕⲧⲟⲛ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲛⲧⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ ⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ
> ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ (17,17–22)

---

[99] E.g. At the transfiguration, the voice from the cloud causes the disciples to be overcome with fear and fall facedown, Matt 17.6; and in Rev 1.17, John falls at the feet of the one like the Son of Man, playing dead. Somewhat similarly, but perhaps out of shame rather than fear, the disciples fall on their faces when finally realizing that the 'ghost' is not a ghost but the risen Christ in EpAp 12.2.

[100] See Michael A. Williams, *The Immovable Race: A Gnostic Designation and the Theme of Stability in Late Antiquity*, NHMS 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1985); King, *Mary*, 63.

[101] Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House, 1979), 12–14; Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 133; King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', 83–92; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 135; Tuckett, *Mary*, 201. Schaberg argues that 'Magdalene Christianity offers an alternative and a challenge to Petrine Christianity, which has never been able to silence it', Schaberg, *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene*, 19.

[102] As the concept of what was acceptable in the mainstream church hardened towards the end of the second century, this may suggest that material was composed/edited into this form no earlier than the second half of the second century. Although the date of composition is not a focus of this work, it may be worth noting.

He asked them about the Saviour, 'Did he speak with a woman secretly (and) not openly to us? Are we to turn and all listen to her? Did he choose her over us?'

Peter's questioning of Mary's status as a woman is certainly an issue in the text – her gender is mentioned three times[103] and relates to Peter's objection in GThom 114 and PistSoph.[104] However, as the majority of scholarship on GMary addresses the gender issue, we will focus on the accusation of secrecy. The nature of the objection is stressed through the repetition of 'secretly' (ⲛ̅ϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ) and 'not publicly' (ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ), and should be read in light of Mary's earlier words: 'What is hidden from you, I will proclaim to you' (ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅ ϯⲛⲁⲧⲁⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ⲉⲣⲟϥ [10,8–9]), where ϩⲏⲡ was used instead of λανθάνει (POxy.GM), heightening antipathy between the disciples.[105]

Contention between open and secret knowledge is seen throughout the body of early Christian literature. In Greco-Roman antiquity, it was common practice that certain things were disclosed only to those who had reached a higher level of understanding, and we have seen this through the 'mystery' language in Paul and the Synoptics. The idea of secrecy was utilized polemically in later authors: Irenaeus claims that the Valentinians considered themselves to be the recipients of hidden wisdom and so only revealed their beliefs to insiders (*Adv. Haer.* 3.15.2),[106] and Celsus made the same claim against all Christians (*c. Cels.* 1.1.7).[107]

It is debatable to what extent Mary's teaching is secret. Although she hears it alone to start with, she does relay it to the other disciples. It is unlike the undisclosed revelation of GThom 13, in which Jesus takes Thomas aside to tell him 'three words' (ⲛ̅ϣⲟⲙⲧ̀ ⲛ̅ϣⲁϫⲉ), but Thomas is unable to repeat these words to the other disciples.[108] Likewise, in 1ApocJas,

---

[103] As well as the quote above, Peter acknowledges that the Saviour loved Mary 'more than the other women' (ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲕⲉⲥⲉⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥ̅ϩ̅ⲓ̅ⲙⲉ [10,3]) and Levi refers to Peter contesting 'the woman' (18,9).

[104] In GThom 114, Peter says that Mary should be removed from the group of disciples 'because women are not worthy of life' (ⲛ̅ⲥϩⲓⲟⲙⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡϣⲁ ⲁⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲡⲱⲛϩ). In PistSoph, Peter protests against Mary talking all the time: 'We are not able to suffer this woman' (ⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲁϣ·ⲁⲛⲉⲭⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲓ̈ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ [1.36 (58,12)]) and Mary later complains that she is afraid of Peter because he threatens her and hates 'our gender' (ⲡⲉⲛⲅⲉⲛⲟⲥ [2.72 (162,16–18)]).

[105] Pasquier notes that Peter's opposition in GMary follows 'le scénario classique de certains évangiles apocryphes et indiquerait deux modes d'enseignement connus'. Peter's problem lies in the fact that '[l]a révélation secrète est un privilège. Elle manifeste l'élection', Pasquier, *Marie*, 98–99.

[106] See also Elaine Hiesey Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975), 57–58.

[107] Also, *c. Cels.* 1.9, 12.

[108] On this see Mark Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 177–79. He writes that GThom 'encourages the initiate to go beyond the public writings in [the] other gospels, and to trump them with its own private revelation' (179).

Jesus' revelation to James is to be revealed only to select people for several generations, when it will be disclosed to everyone (_NHC_ 36,13–37,22). The GMary scenario is closer to John 20 in that Jesus speaks to Mary alone, but instructs her to tell her brothers that he is ascending (20.17).

3.4.3. *Peter the Adversary*

After Peter's attack on Mary, she weeps and asks why he accuses her of lying. Before Peter has a chance to respond, Levi steps in, rebuking Peter and defending Mary:

> ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲗⲉⲩⲉⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟ`ⲥ′ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ ϫⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲕϣⲟⲡ ⲛⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ †ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲣ̄ⲅⲩⲙⲛⲁϫⲉ ⲉϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓ̈ⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲧⲓⲕⲉⲓⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲁⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ⲉⲛⲟϫⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (18,5–12)
>
> Levi answered, he said to Peter, 'Peter you are always wrathful! I see you now disputing with the woman like the adversaries. If the Saviour made her worthy, who are you to reject her?'

> Πετρε ἀ[ει] σο[ι] το οργιλον· παρακειται και αρτι ουτως συνζητει[ς] τη γυναικι ως αντικειμενος αὐτη (PRyl.GM 22, 2–4)
>
> Peter, wrath is always with yo[u], and so now you are disputing with the woman like an adversary to her.

Here we see another variation between the Greek and Coptic MSS that again heightens the antagonism between the disciples. The Greek Levi says to Peter 'wrath is always with you' (το οργιλον παρακειται [22,2]), but the Coptic Levi calls him 'wrathful' (ⲛⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ [18,7–8]). Although the meanings are similar, the Coptic puts Peter in line with an evil cosmic power that the Soul must overcome called 'the Wisdom [of the] Wrathful One' (ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ [ⲛ̄]ⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ [16,11–12]).[109]

---

[109] *Contra,* Tuckett and Hartenstein who regard any polemic against Peter as mild, if present at all, Tuckett, *Mary*, e.g. 197, 203; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 133–34. Hartenstein refers to Peter and Levi as having a common basis in both accepting the Saviour as authoritative. Tuckett regards το οργιλον παρακειται//ⲛⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ as 'less an accusation *against* Peter an indirect apology *for* Peter, excusing his behaviour: Peter's accusation is simply due to his impetuosity, and may not reflect his more measured thought' (202; italics original).

The gulf between Mary and the male disciples is further reinforced by Levi in the Coptic reading:

ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱ`ⲥ′ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲱⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲟϣ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ (18,13–15)

Surely the Saviour knew her infallibly, and therefore he loved her *more than us*.

παντως γαρ εκεινος ειδως αυτην ασφ[αλ]ῳ[ς] ηγαπησεν (PRyl.GM 22,6–8)

For surely he, knowing her i[n]fallib[ly], loved (her).

Although both versions confess that the Saviour loved Mary, the Coptic emphasizes her exalted status by adding 'more than us' (ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ).[110] The comparative widens the gap between Mary and the male disciples, and fits with the harsher language used by the Coptic Levi to Peter, discussed in the last example. The Coptic Mary's exalted status is always at the expense of Peter. In the Greek manuscripts, the disciples are on a more level playing field.

3.4.4. *The Last Words of Levi*

Levi's speech becomes the final spoken words in the gospel. As Mary presumably continues to weep silently, Levi reminds them all of the Saviour's instructions.[111]

ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̅ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ϯ ϩⲓ̈ⲱⲱⲛ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ϫⲡⲟϥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥϩⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲕⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̅ⲕⲉϩⲟⲣⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲕⲉⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡ̅ⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲟⲟϥ (18,15–21)

---

[110] It has been debated whether the comparative was original. Marjanen suggests a Greek original which read along the lines of ἠγάπησεν μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἤ ἡμᾶς. The scribe of PRyl.GM missed a few words between two instances of μᾶλλον (one in Marjanen's reconstructed clause and the μᾶλλον following ἠγάπησεν in PRyl.GM), Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 116. Tuckett agrees, as 1) 'why would a later scribe add such a harsh comment?' and 2) the comparative phrase 'provides a striking, if somewhat ironic, twist by Levi to Peter's earlier words that Mary was loved by the Saviour more than the other women', Tuckett, *Mary*, 129.

[111] Tuckett emphasizes this point: 'Further, it may or may not be significant that, in the sequel, the main response to Peter's (and derivatively Andrew's) charges against Mary does not come from Mary herself but from Levi (though Mary does make an initial response at 18.2–5). At one level, of course, Mary is simply adopting the role expected of a woman at the time in being silent. Yet this is somewhat at odds with the earlier part of the gospel where Mary has been far from passive or silent! All this may suggest, though, at least negatively, that Mary's "character" is not quite as perfect as some have suggested: she too can display the weaknesses which the other disciples showed earlier. However positive the picture of Mary in the gospel is in general terms, there are also features that are not quite so positive!', Tuckett, *Mary*, 189–90.

Rather, let us be ashamed and put on the Perfect Man and acquire him for ourselves as he commanded us and preach the gospel, not laying down other rules or another la[w] beyond what the Saviour told us.

μαλλ[ο]ν αισχυ[ν]θῶ[με]ν και ενδυσαμενο[ι] τον τ[ελειο]ν α̅ν̅ο̅ν̅ εκεινο το προστα<χ>θ[εν η]μειν π[ο]ιησωμεν κηρυσ{ε}σ[ειν το] ευαγγ[ε]λιον μηδεν ο[ρ]ιζον τ[ες μ]ηδε νομοθετ[ο]υντες ως ειπ[εν ο] σωτηρ (PRyl.GM 22,8–14)

Rath[e]r, l[et] us be as[h]amed and, having put on the P[erfect] Man, let [u]s do what was comm[an]ded us, to pre[ach the] gos[p]el, la[yi]ng down nothing [n]or law-making, as [the] Saviour sai[d].

Here Levi is paraphrasing what Jesus said in his farewell discourse: (1) put on the Perfect Man and (2) acquire him = (1) Son of Man is within and (2) follow, seek and find him. Secondly, preaching the gospel and not laying down any rules unmistakeably reflect the Saviour's FD. Furthermore, Levi emphasizes that he is referring to Jesus' earlier words by saying 'as he commanded us' (ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥ ϩⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ̅ [18,17]) and 'beyond what the Saviour told us' (ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲥⲱ̅ⲣ ϫⲟⲟϥ [18,21]).[112]

3.4.5. *The Ambiguous Finale*

The conclusion of the narrative is perhaps GMary's greatest mystery. The variation between the Greek and Coptic MSS alters the whole gospel. Although the Rylands MS is fragmentary, it is unlikely that it read anything different from:

[ταυ]τα ειπων ο Λευ[εις μεν απελθων] η̣ρ̣χεν κη̣[ρυσσειν] (PRyl.GM 22,14–16)

When he had said [the]se things Levi dep[arted] and he began to pr[each.]

---

[112] King, Lührmann and Tuckett suggest that the use of ὡς in Greek and ⲡⲁⲣⲁ in Coptic changes the meaning of the text. In the Coptic, the disciples must not lay down any rules *beyond* what the Saviour said, whereas the Greek reads *as* the Saviour said. King and Lührmann see the Coptic as softening the command, King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', 617; Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 119. Tuckett suggests that the Coptic is a 'somewhat over-literalistic, secondary attempt to tie Levi's words together with Jesus', Tuckett, *Mary*, 131. But in his FD, Jesus tells the disciples not to lay down rules '*beyond* what I appointed to you' (ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲟϣϥ̄ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ [9,1–2]) *and* not to givegive a law '*like* the Lawgiver' (ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲑⲉⲧⲏⲥ [9,3]). Therefore, either 'beyond' or 'as' can refer back to the Saviour's speech. I see the difference between the meanings in the Greek and Coptic versions of Levi's instruction as relatively insignificant (both refer back to Jesus) and unlikely to be the result of active interpretation by a translator/scribe.

Despite the lacunae, the extant singular verb ἤρχεν matches ὁ Λευείς and so it is safe to assume that Levi alone departs and preaches. The Coptic, on the other hand, reads:

[ⲚⲦⲈⲢⲈ ± 8]ⲁ̈ⲓ ⲁⲨⲱ ⲁⲨⲢⲀⲢⲬⲈⲒ ⲚⲂⲰⲔ [ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲦ]ⲀⲘⲞ ⲚⲤⲈⲦⲀϢⲈⲞⲈⲒϢ (18,21–19,2)

[When ± 8] and *they* began to depart [to tea]ch and preach

The plural ⲀⲨⲢⲀⲢⲬⲈⲒ (they began) agrees with ⲚⲤⲈⲦⲀϢⲈⲞⲈⲒϢ (and they to preach) and so the plural is unquestionable. However, it is unclear who 'they' are. Do Peter and Andrew follow Levi in listening to Mary and putting on the Perfect Man, and then proclaim the gospel? Or are Peter and Andrew left behind as Mary and Levi go out to preach? As has been argued, the Coptic text strengthens animosity between the disciples, but does it here imply a reconciliation or rule it out altogether?

GMary interpreters are undecided which way to read it. Marjanen suggests that, due to the tense tone of Levi's final speech, the Coptic is a 'cumbersome correction' intended to include Mary alone.[113] Tuckett writes of being left in a 'textual limbo' over whether the breach is healed.[114] If Levi and Mary do not get through to Peter and Andrew, the purpose of the gospel is transformed. A lack of reconciliation would ensure that, despite friendship prior to Mary's revelation, there is continued polemic against other Christians. Those Christians that Peter and Andrew represent will not accept the higher teachings of the heavenly Soul. It would also warn against certain, possibly Petrine traditions that deny private revelation and belittle female authority.

The Greek text certainly undermines Mary's authority – she does not teach. Perkins doubts whether Mary ever received the Saviour's command to preach:

Although the narrative elements in *Gospel of Mary* depict her as the first to attain gnosis, she is not a recipient of the commission to preach the gospel to the nations. *Gospel of Mary* evidently understands the narrative accounts in which the risen Jesus sends his followers out to preach to refer only to the male disciples.[115]

---

[113] Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 119.
[114] Tuckett, *Mary*, 193.
[115] Pheme Perkins, *Gnosticism and the New Testament* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 183.

Tuckett also raises this question:

> [T]he exhortation to preach is given earlier in the gospel to the male disciples, before Mary appears on the scene (8.21–2, before 9.12). Thus it is by no means clear that Mary is ever envisaged as an active preacher of the gospel at all.[116]

The idea that Mary was not an intended recipient of the commission, as well as being implied by the ending of the Rylands fragment, is supported by her Paraclete-type role. Mary rises as Jesus departs, and it is because of Jesus' departure that Mary rises. Therefore, although she may have been in the group of disciples for Jesus' dialogue, she does not play an active role, and the commission was not aimed at her.

The possibility that 'they' in the Coptic text did not include Mary is supported by Mary's own words to her brothers. When they weep over the idea of mission-related persecution, Mary says:

> ⲙⲡⲣⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲣⲣⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲣ ϩⲏⲧ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲧⲉϥⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄
> ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲥ̄ⲣ̄ⲥⲕⲉⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟϭ ⲇⲉ
> ⲁϥⲥⲃ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁϥⲁⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ (9,14–20)[117]
>
> Do not weep and do not grieve and do not doubt! For his grace will be with you all and will protect you. Rather let us give thanks for his greatness, for he has prepared us, he has made us Men.

Mary does not say that Jesus' grace will be with *us* and protect *us*. Yet, the first-person plural is acceptable when she refers to giving thanks and to making the disciples (perfect) Men.[118] Mary, despite her gender, can become a Perfect Man (in fact, she already has), but she may not be a member of the preaching mission. This need not mean much on its own, but PistSoph provides a similar impression of these gender politics. In PistSoph, Mary plays an active role (perhaps the most active), relentlessly questioning Jesus to the point that he tells

---

[116] He continues: 'Mary is thus not necessarily presented as the archetypal, or ideal, preacher of the gospel. Rather, she is presented more as the reliable guarantor of (at least part of) the *content* of the gospel, as the recipient of the revelation, which perhaps *others* (Levi and perhaps other male followers) go and preach', Tuckett, *Mary*, 198 (italics original). Tuckett wonders whether the text is similar to Mark's shorter ending, with the women being silent in fear (194, n.216).

[117] For the reading ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̣, see Appendix 2.

[118] POxy.GM is not helpful here as these lines are so fragmentary.

her she must allow the others to ask questions too (4.146 [377,16–17]). She is continually called blessed. But at one point she says:

> ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ · ⲙ̅ⲡⲣ̅ϭⲱⲛ̅ⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲉⲓ̈ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲉⲛⲱⲭⲗⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲟⲡ ·
> ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣ̅ϭⲱⲛ̅ⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲉⲓ̈ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲱⲣ̅ϫ ⲙ̅ⲛ ⲟⲩⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓⲁ ϫⲉ
> ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲕⲏⲣⲩⲥⲥⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲅⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙ̅ⲛⲧⲣⲱⲙⲉ (2.88 [201,10–14])
>
> My Lord, be not angry with me that I question you because I have troubled you many times. Now my Lord, be not angry with me that I question all things with assurance and certainty, because *my brothers* preach them among the nations of humankind.

In chapter two, we saw examples from EpAp and EpPetPhil in which male disciples persistently question the Lord so as to be equipped for mission. In PistSoph, Mary persistently questions the Lord because *her brothers* preach. She does not say because 'we' preach. There is no explanation of this, which perhaps suggests that it is just a given that women do not preach.

Levi preaching alone in PRyl.GM means that Peter and Andrew do not. Tuckett argues that the Greek GMary does not imply polemic against Peter: '[T]he Greek text simply implies that, at this point, Levi goes out to preach: it may imply that, at this time, Peter does not – but that in no way excludes the possibility that Peter goes out to preach later!'[119] This seems unlikely. If Peter was to preach, having listened to Levi and accepted Mary's authority, *the text would state it*. In the Greek text, the final point about Peter likens him to the ἀντικείμενος/ἀντικειμένοι – this, surely, points to polemic.

It seems more likely, then, that the Coptic text, by continually portraying heightened antagonism between Peter/Andrew and Mary/Levi, allows for a greater reconciliation between the two groups (a reconciliation that would not be as potent had the disciples been less averse to each other, as in the Greek MSS). Just as Andrew in PistSoph comes to realize that the ascent of the Soul is correct doctrine, the Coptic Peter and Andrew most likely accept Levi's instructions in GMary – especially as they are just rehashing the Saviour's words. Whether Mary preaches or not is unclear, but, in light of PistSoph, probably not.

---

[119] Tuckett, *Mary*, 194.

Conclusion

GMary cannot easily be divided into dialogue and narrative frame; the two eschatological dialogues are integrally connected to the narrative that surrounds it. And much of this narrative frame encompasses its own dialogues. Within the 'narrative frame', I have included the Saviour's farewell discourse, Mary's Paraclete moment, her downfall at the hands of Peter and Andrew, the final instructions from Levi, and the disciple(s) leaving to preach. I have also suggested that a narrative setting opened the gospel. Most of these sections include dialogue between the disciples themselves, whether it be comforting conversation or argument.

The narrative frame tells us a lot about the message of GMary. It most likely began with an explicit post-resurrection setting, and the opening dialogue is set on the eve of Jesus' final departure. The disciples are going to be left alone; their Saviour is leaving them forever. In the farewell discourse, Jesus prepares them for this, giving them instructions for the individual and for the community.

Jesus' departure then brings Mary to the forefront, in a Paraclete-type role. She comforts the male disciples and teaches them about their salvation. I have argued that the way she is portrayed in relation to the male disciples has different nuances in the Greek and Coptic versions of the gospel. The Coptic signifies a greater sense of antagonism between Mary and Peter/Andrew: in the Greek, Jesus has knitted his disciples into one community, whereas in the Coptic, Mary does not kiss her heretical brothers. The breach between them is dramatized after Mary's account of the ascending Soul, in both Greek and Coptic, with accusations of heresy, secrecy and ill will. It may be resolved when Levi reminds them of Jesus' instructions before he departed, and this may or may not bring reconciliation to the group.

The surrounding narrative sets the scene for the two main dialogues: the Saviour and his disciples and Mary's account of her vision of the Lord. Both are eschatological in nature, the first concerned with cosmic eschatology and the second with personal salvation.

Chapter Four

The Cosmos and Its Undoing: The Cosmic Eschatology of the *Gospel of Mary*

At the beginning of the extant gospel, a disciple asks the Saviour whether Matter will be destroyed. The Saviour replies that every nature, form and creature, created from Matter, will be dissolved to its root. As discussed briefly in chapter one, the texts within the dialogue gospel genre have divergent views on cosmic eschatology. Some are not particularly interested in the end of the world, but the idea that the cosmos is perishable lies in the background (SophJesChr, GJudas) and that all things will return to their origins (ApJohn). Others conceive of apocalyptic signs, the parousia and judgement at the end of age (ApocPet, EpAp). In PistSoph, cosmic and individual eschatology converge, as all souls will ascend to the heavens at the end of the age, when the cosmos dissolves. On the whole, the destruction or dissolution of the world is secondary to human salvation in dialogue gospels, but they still reflect the fact that the end of the world is a significant theme in early Christianity.[1] On this topic, GMary finds significant dialogue partners in GThom and the canonical gospels.

In this chapter, I will attempt to show that the cosmology of GMary is simpler and more christocentric than has been assumed by past exegetes. The heavens and the earth are formed from Matter. This material cosmos will be restored to its origins through dissolution. The text is broken and convoluted and it is not clear what will be dissolved, why it will be dissolved, or how it will be dissolved. These questions will be addressed in two stages. Firstly, the cosmological question of how Matter is understood in relation to forms and creatures, which in turn asks how to understand GMary's vocabulary of 'nature', 'passion', 'sin' and 'death'. Secondly, the question of how to understand the role of Christ in relation to 'the Good' and the Son of Man. It will be shown how GMary's cosmic eschatology fits within the wider Christian landscape, arguing that Matter is the raw material of the cosmos, which will be dissolved at the hand of Christ.

---

[1] For the argument that the 'end of the world' is significant in early Christian eschatology, see Edward Adams, *The Stars Will Fall From Heaven: Cosmic Catastrophe in the New Testament and Its World*. LNTS 347 (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2007).

4.1. The Cosmos and the Dissolution of the Cosmos

4.1.1. *Matter as the Raw Material of the Cosmos*

The extant gospel begins with an eschatological question and reply, followed by a short discourse on sin (7,9–16) and then a further explanation regarding cosmic eschatology:

(Q1) ⲑ[ⲩ]ⲗⲏ ϭⲉ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱ[ϭ]ⲡ ϫⲛ ⲙ̇ⲙⲟⲛ (7,1–2)

then will M[a]tter be dest[r]oyed or not?

(A1) ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲕⲧⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩϣⲟⲡ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ {ⲙ}ⲛⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ

ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲏ ⲉⲥⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̇ⲁ

ⲧⲉⲥⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲥ (7,3–8)

Every nature, every form, every creature exist in (and) with each other and will be dissolved again to their own root; for the nature of Matter is to dissolve to the elements (of) its nature alone.

(A2) ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟ(ⲛ) ϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲏⲧⲉ ϣⲁ ⲛⲁ ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ

ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ) ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ (7,17–20)

This is why the Good came into your midst to the things of every nature, so as to restore it inward to its root.

Q1 contains the end of a question regarding the fate of 'Matter' (Q1).[2] We do not know who asked the question, what it followed or what the context was – although, as discussed in the previous chapter, it is likely to be the penultimate question from a list of many, posed by one or more of the disciples looking for clear information from the Saviour following his resurrection. Q1 is followed by a reply directly from the Saviour (A1) regarding the current make-up and future dissolution of nature, form and creature. The Saviour explains that nature, form and creature are currently constructed from Matter, but Matter will be dissolved

---

[2] Martin argues against the translation of ὕλη as 'matter' due to the varying meanings in ancient philosophies that depart from our modern one. See Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 6–10. For GMary, this is made even more complicated as we are dealing with the Coptic article and noun ϩⲩⲗⲏ, which is also heavily reconstructed at 7,1. Luckily, as ⲑⲩⲗⲏ appears again in A1 we can assume that it is the same term in Q1. Although I will translate this term as 'Matter' (capitalized where appropriate), we must be aware that our modern definition of the term is not the same as in the ancient world.

to its own root. A2 follows a teaching on the nature of sin (called adultery) and reinforces A1 regarding the dissolution of Matter. However, A2 takes A1 further: A1 appears to be concerned with the natural dissolution of created Matter but A2 explains that the dissolution is dependent upon the 'Good'.

To understand the text's eschatology, we must first make sense of its cosmology.[3] The primary question is: What will be dissolved? There are several caveats to bear in mind when working with the first pages of the Berlin Codex, such as the previous missing text, reconstructed words such as ϫ[ⲡ]ⲉ̣ (8,2), the possibility that the meaning behind the Greco-Coptic vocabulary such as ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ, ⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ and ⲡⲩⲗⲏ is not the same as that of their Greek forerunners,[4] and that the text probably contains ideas that the author considered self-evident, particularly those that we might regard as Platonic or Stoic. By the second century, philosophical schools of thought frequently borrowed each other's conceptuality,[5] and Stoic terms and concepts in particular were used without knowledge of their provenance.[6] Nonetheless, as we shall see, GMary shares much in common with Platonic concepts, interpreted christologically.

With this in mind, we must attempt to answer what it is that Jesus says will be dissolved. In his first answer (A1), he tells his disciples that nature, form, creature and Matter will be dissolved, but he does not explain what these constructs mean or how they relate to each other. It is probably presupposed that the language of nature, form and creature is to be understood as the material things, moulded from Matter. Matter as the raw material from which God forms the cosmos is common to Christian and philosophical thinking. Platonists,

---

[3] We might propose that a cosmogonic narrative was included in the preceding dialogue in GMary; however, this would be based on little substantial evidence. Tuckett mentions that the origin of the universe was of concern to other 'gnostic' writers; Tuckett, *Mary*, 138–39. However, the cosmogonies of dialogue gospels are varied and so it is difficult to apply them to GMary.

[4] Although, here, φύσις, πάθος, and ὕλη may be on safe ground. They are so commonly used that the meanings remained largely the same through the language transmission.

[5] For modern readers, the extant cosmological motifs, including the intentions, principles and nuances, do not fit into any established typology, and we must be vigilant against the scholarly tendency to start labelling ideas 'Platonic' or 'Stoic' at every opportunity. Platonism and Stoicism did influence early Christianity, however; see the following two collections of essays: Tuomas Rasimus, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Ismo Dunderberg, eds., *Stoicism in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010); Kevin Corrigan and Tuomas Rasimus, eds., *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*, NHMS 82 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013). It must also be mentioned that just because a text has a Greco-Roman background, that does not exclude overlap with Jewish thought. For example, Adams highlights similar ideas between Jewish, Epicurean and Stoic eschatological views, Adams, *The Stars Will Fall From Heaven*, 127–29. In terms of eschatology and the afterlife, however, there is no typical 'Jewish' view, but a plurality of beliefs existed side by side; see Outi Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, NovTSupp 123 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 119–54.

[6] See John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220, Revised* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996), xiv–xv.

Stoics, and Jewish and Christian interpreters of Genesis hold (admittedly different) versions of the theory that a divine or celestial force formed passive matter into created order. Genesis 1.2 LXX speaks of an invisible and unformed earth (ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος), subsequently shaped by God.[7] Plato understands matter as the quality-less material from which the cosmos is created by a 'demiurge' or divine craftsman (*Tim.* 51a)[8] and the Stoics see matter as an unqualified substance (τὴν ἄποιον οὐσίαν) that is acted upon by god (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. Phil.* 7.134).

These concepts permeated early Christian thinkers (and not just those that profess a demiurge-creator).[9] Justin understood God to have created all things 'from formless matter' (ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης [*1 Apol.* 10]) and Tatian wrote that 'the whole construction and creation of the world has derived from matter (ἐξ ὕλης), and that matter has itself been produced by God… so that everything has a common origin' (*Or. Graec.* 12.22–29). Theophilus understood God as creating amorphous matter and then giving it form (*ad Autol.* 2.4.10), whereas Irenaeus' God creates and shapes matter in a single act (*Adv. Haer.* 2.28.7).[10] The Jesus of PistSoph tells Andrew about the angels, archangels, god, archons and other cosmic bodies, and discloses: 'You are all (existing) with one another out of one dough and one matter, and one substance. And you are all out of the same mixture' (ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲏⲣⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲣⲏⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲱϣⲙ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲛ †ϩⲩⲗⲏ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ · ⲙ̄ⲛ †ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲕⲉⲣⲁⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲧⲏⲣⲧⲛ̄ [249,1–4]).[11] For all their differences, these writers are united in the belief that creation came into being by the imposition of form on unformed matter.

GMary's terminology is preceded in Paul, who can use κτίσις for all of creation (e.g. Rom 8.18–23) and πλάσμα to mean 'the thing formed' (Rom 9.20).[12] In the Patristic era, φύσις came to take on a multitude of meanings, including the substance of created things.[13]

---

[7] ἀκατασκεύαστος, as 'an antonym of the verb κατασκεύαζω (to construct), implies an unconstructed state and is thus an apt description of the earth before God speaks its elements into existence', Susan Brayford, *Genesis*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 207.

[8] Plato does not actually speak of 'formless matter' but of the formless state of creation. Matter is the mother and receptacle of Form: 'an invisible, formless receptacle of everything' (*Tim.* 51a).

[9] By 'demiurge' I mean a lesser deity than the highest God. The term can also refer to the highest God, as in *1 Clem.* 20.11 and Justin *1Apol.* 8.2; see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 342b.

[10] On the origins of the concept of *creatio ex nihilo*, see Gerhard May, *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*, trans. A. S. Worrall (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

[11] Dough, matter and substance appear to be synonyms in PistSoph, as nature, form and creature are in GMary.

[12] For Paul's use of κτίσις see Edward Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*, Studies of the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), esp. 19–20.

[13] φύσις is often used in a creation context and can refer to incorporeal creation such as heavenly creatures, or creation generally, or the constitution of things (1496a-1497a), Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1496a–1497a.

GMary's notion that Matter had been shaped into every nature, creature and form (also referred to as the earthly and heavenly things [15,19–16,1]) was evidently shared among contemporary Christian thinkers.

It is this moulded Matter that forms the 'cosmos' or 'world' (ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ), and it is the 'world' from which the personified Soul becomes free during her eschatological heavenly ascent. During the Soul's journey, she says:

`ϩⲛ̀` ⲟⲩ[ⲕⲟⲥ]ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩⲃⲟⲗⲧ̀ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩ]ⲱ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ (16,21–17,3)

In a [wor]ld I was dissolved from a world, [an]d in a type from a type which is above.

The Greco-Coptic term ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ is another use of vocabulary found in the doctrines of philosophical schools and Paul. However, GMary's conception of the 'world' diverges from the main tenets of the major philosophical schools – the Presocratics believed that it was not created (as in Heraclitus fr. 30); Plato imagined that it would never be destroyed (*Tim.* 41a-b); the Epicureans believed it would naturally dissolve (*Letter to Pythocles* 88); and the Stoics did not conceive of God and κόσμος as separate entities (e.g. Diogenes Laertius).[14] The point at which GMary's worldview does converge with the philosophers is that the κόσμος, in its best state, is characterized by order and unity (a shared assumption in the great variety of Greek and Hellenistic cosmological speculation[15]). GMary's cosmos must be dissolved due to the 'disturbance' (ⲧⲁⲣⲁⲭⲏ) that has occurred in the whole 'body' (ⲥⲱⲙⲁ) (8,5–6) – the word often used in Plato for the 'world'. But, for GMary, it is due to the *disturbance* that the *created* world will be *dissolved* through the agency of *Christ* (who is a quite separate entity from the world).[16]

GMary's understanding of the term ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ comes closer to Paul. In Paul, κόσμος has 'a spectrum of usage from strongly negative at the one end (for the world in its distance from

---

[14] For discussion of the use of κόσμος in these schools, including these references, see Adams, *Constructing the World*, 44–58.

[15] See Adams, *Constructing the World*, 64–65.

[16] There is no need to read a demiurgical creator into the gospel, and presumably if one was intended, the Soul would have met it during her heavenly journey (Paul meets the demiurge in the seventh heaven in ApPaul 22,23–23,28). De Boer argues against the possibility of a demiurge in GMary, writing that 'the world is not created by an inferior Demiurge, but is created by God himself through his Nature', de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 202. Tuckett, on the other hand, contends that a version of the Sophia and Yaldabaoth myth 'may be among the presuppositions which it [GMary] assumes as a given and from which it then goes on to draw out other implications', Tuckett, *Mary*, 53.

and hostility to God), to highly positive at the other (for the world as God's good creation)', but his 'predominant style of usage is negative'.[17] Paul's negative sense, as found for example in Rom 5.12, is comparable to the use in GMary, which appears to understand the 'world' as a place of sin and death, corrupted by passion. It is from this ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ, constructed from Matter, that the Soul will be freed.

4.1.2. *The Dissolution is Restoration*

How, then, does the 'restoration' of every nature in A2 relate to the 'dissolution' of material creation in A1? Pasquier, King and Tuckett feel the pull of a dualistic-gnostic cosmology at this point, assuming an opposition that differentiates between 'every nature' that will 'dissolve' (ⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ) in A1 and 'every nature' that will be 'restored' (ⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ) in A2. Due to the phrase 'the nature of Matter' (ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲏ), they understand the first 'nature' (to be dissolved) as belonging to the lower material realm and the second 'nature' (to be restored) as part of the superior, spiritual realm. Pasquier sees the second 'nature' as 'l'antithèse de la première',[18] and Tuckett agrees, writing that 'confusingly the Coptic text uses the same word ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ("nature") for both'.[19] King does not make this point quite so explicitly but alludes to it, stating that 'the "root" of perishable matter is contrasted with the proper "root" of a person's true spiritual nature which the Good will establish'.[20] The material nature is dissolved and so destroyed, whereas the heavenly nature is restored to its root.[21]

However, reading the *two uses* of the terms 'nature' and 'root' as representing *two natures* and *two roots* is also confusing – and unnecessary. De Boer argues that the two uses of 'nature' can mean the same thing, proposing a Stoic reading (in the sense that Stoic philosophy can help clarify the text's meaning, not that the text is Stoic), arguing that Matter and nature are intertwined rather than contrasted. She argues that 'ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ in GosMar 7.3–4 as well as in 7.18–19 refers to all natural phenomena (all Nature) as an appearance of the

---

[17] Adams, *Constructing the World*, 241.
[18] Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie', 393.
[19] Tuckett, *Mary*, 142.
[20] King, *Mary*, 51 (see also 45–46, 50). Also, Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften*, 27; Tardieu, *Écrits Gnostiques*, 226.
[21] The addition of ⲙ̅ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ('their own', 7,6) might support their point, but both uses of ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ (root) have a singular possessive article and so the 'united' root of the 'heavenly nature' to which Pasquier appeals is unconvincing, Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie,' 391–92, cf. de Boer, 'A Stoic Reading of the Gospel of Mary,' 203.

Divine'.[22] This interpretation is much closer to my own – that Matter is the raw material acted upon by God (which the Stoics would call 'Nature').[23]

For GMary, it is easier and clearer to understand the repeated terms 'every nature' and 'root' in A1 and A2 as referring to the same thing, and thus the same action. 'Every nature' (A2) is simply a terse way of referring to 'Every nature, every form, every creature', which exist together as the created heavens and earth. Nature, form and creature are not different from Matter – they are created from Matter. And at the eschaton, creation will be dissolved – unformed, unbound and returned to its original constituent state, called here its 'root' (ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ). This does not mean that there is no heavenly realm; we will meet the Soul's journey home in the next chapter. But it is clear that A2 is not referring to the restoration of the Soul, as Andrew and Peter deny ever having heard a teaching like this. And so, both ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ in 7,3–4 and 7,18–19 refer to creation that will be dissolved and thus restored to its origins (roots). The eschatology is also protological. The dissolution is the restoration.

The concept of the dissolution of the cosmos places GMary firmly among other works of early Christian literature.[24] In BookThom, we read: '(There is) little time until what is visible will dissolve' (ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ̈ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉϥⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [141,14–15]). And 2 Peter speaks of the day

> ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα *κατακαήσεται* (2 Pet 3.10)[25]
>
> ... in which the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and everything that is done on it will be burned up.

Dissolution of the heavens and the earth (or the visible things) is also a feature of the Synoptics and GThom. Although the synoptic language of dissolution is tied up with the renewal of all things (Matt 19.28) and the contrast between the unsound world and the eternal

---

[22] de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 37. Pasquier also notes that the language is dependent on Stoicism, Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie', 392.

[23] 'In Stoic philosophy, matter is formed by Nature into a harmonious cosmos', de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 37.

[24] Ehrman contrasts the eschatology in GMary with the proto-orthodox 'apocalyptic' view, in which 'matter will not be destroyed but redeemed when God reasserts his will over the good creation that he made', Bart D. Ehrman, *Peter, Paul, and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in History and Legend* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 240.

[25] κατακαήσεται is a variant but well attested reading, which makes sense in this context whether or not it was the original reading. For the variants (and support of the usual εὑρεθήσεται, as in NA[28]), see Al Wolters, 'Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10', *Westminster Theological Journal* 49 (1987): 405–13.

nature of Jesus' words (Matt 24.35 + pars), GMary shares an almost identical phrase with the Olivet Discourse: 'Heaven and earth will pass away' (ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται [Matt 24.35 + pars]), and 'all things are dissolving, both the things of the earth and the things of the heav[en] (ⲉⲩⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲧⲡ[ⲉ] [15,20–16,1]). This idea appears also in GThom 11 and 111:

> ⲡⲉⲝⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲝⲉ ⲧⲉⲉⲓⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲡⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ (GThom 11.1)
>
> Jesus said, 'This heaven will pass away, and the one above it will pass away'.

> ⲡⲉⲝⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲝⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲁϭⲱⲗ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ϥⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲙⲟⲩ (GThom 111.1)
>
> Jesus said, 'The heavens and the earth will roll up in your presence and he who lives from the Living One will not see death'.

However, GThom diverges from the Synoptics as its eschatology is cast in protological terms. If we interpret logion 18, which tells us that the 'end' (ϩⲁⲏ) is found in the place of the 'beginning' (ⲁⲣⲭⲏ), in terms of cosmic eschatology, then a protological understanding of the cosmos dissolving to its origins comes to light.[26] And we find this also in GMary through the use of the term 'root'.

Protological eschatology does not have to be an oxymoron. It denotes an ending in which things return to their beginnings. Davies argues that salvation in GThom is found in the original condition of Gen 1.1–2.4, and that humanity should 'restore themselves to the condition of the image of God' and live 'with the rest and immortality proper to the seventh day of creation'.[27] GMary appears to see the original condition as the pre-created state. It shares more in common with ApJohn: 'It is because of you that all things have come into being, and it is to you that all things will return' (ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧⲕ` ⲁⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ` ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩϩϥ` ⲉⲣⲟⲕ [NHC2 9,7–8]). In GMary, the material cosmos (also called 'all things' [15,20]) will return to the 'root' from which things were created. The broader concept of eschatological dissolution is shared with BookThom, 2 Peter and the Synoptics, but in GMary

---

[26] In GThom 18, the disciples ask about 'our end' and the end probably refers to both the cosmic end and the individual end. Gathercole favours the former, DeConick the latter; Simon Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*, TENT 11 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), 286–88; April D. DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*, LNTS 287 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 102.

[27] Stevan Davies, 'The Christology and Protology of the "Gospel of Thomas"', *JBL* 111, no. 4 (1992): 664.

it is narrowed into a protological understanding of restoration to an original or past state, as in GThom and ApJohn.

4.1.3. *The Birth of Passion*

GMary sees the need for dissolution as due to a corruption of the cosmos. The world itself is not the cause of the problem; rather, the world made of Matter has been contaminated through the production of passion:

> [ⲁⲑ]ⲩⲗⲏ ⲝ[ⲡ]ⲉ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲟⲩⲧⲁⲣⲁⲭⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣϥ (8,2–10)
>
> [Mat]ter [produc]ed a passion without likeness, which came forth unnaturally. Then a disturbance occurs in the whole body.

Matter's production of passion was unnatural.[28] Passion leads to sin and renders humanity under the influence of malevolent cosmic powers, which the Soul can defeat. Although this leads to a generally pessimistic view of the world and also the body, there is no evidence here of an extreme cosmological dualism that regards the created cosmos as inherently evil or as the flawed product of a wicked and ignorant demiurge.[29] Rather, as King writes: 'The Savior argues that the material world is destined to dissolve back into its original root-nature; he does not say that it is evil and will be destroyed'.[30]

The negative opinion of passion rather than Matter itself makes more sense in the context. In early Christian thought, passions were vices to be controlled. To be under the influence of passions was to suffer. Paul recognizes that living under the influence of fleshly passions and desires is to be living without life (Gal 5.24); and the Paul of Colossians links πάθος to sexual immorality, impurity, desire and evil (Col 3.5, cf. Rom 1.26–27). Along with

---

[28] An alternative translation is provided by de Boer: 'Matter [brought forth] passion that, since it proceeds from an opposite nature, has no form. From then on confusion exists in the whole body', de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 41. She imagines that 'a combination of matter and an opposite nature [ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ] are responsible' for producing passion, resulting in an unstable cosmos (47). The disciples must thus be freed from 'ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ'. Rather than reading ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ as a noun, however, we should read the clause adverbially – it is not 'an opposite nature' that the disciples must be freed from, but passions produced unnaturally.
[29] Most commentators insist that matter is the cause of passion: Pasquier, *Marie*, 54; Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 40; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 129.
[30] King, *Mary*, 46.

Paul, the Stoic concept that all passions are vices[31] influenced Clement who read the fight 'not against flesh and blood' in Eph 6.12 as a fight against the passions (ἐμπαθῶν παθῶν) (*Strom.* 7.3.20.16–17).[32] Furthermore, the language that passion was produced without likeness (ⲉⲓⲛⲉ) was a recognized technique, albeit a complicated one, to depict corrupt creation.[33] In ApJohn, Sophia wants to bring forth a likeness (ⲉⲓⲛⲉ) of herself (ₙₕ𝒸₂ 9,28–29), but because she does not have the consent of the Spirit nor her partner, her offspring is not made in her likeness (10,7–14), and becomes the evil creator deity.[34] It is passion, not Matter, that is not made in the likeness of the divine, and thus creates chaos within the otherwise-ordered cosmos. On a human level, passions act against the Soul's true heavenly nature of silence and Rest, and create sin and death. And that is why Mary tells the disciples: 'be united in heart and if you are disjointed, nevertheless be united in the presence of each likeness of the nature' (ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲏⲧ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲟ ⲛ̅ⲛⲁⲧⲧⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲏⲧ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛ̅ⲛⲁϩⲣⲙ̅ ⲡⲓⲛⲉ ⲡⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ [8,7–10]).

4.1.4. *A Life under Sin and Death*

Passion causes sin and death. After the question about the dissolution of Matter (A1), there is another question and answer regarding sin:

ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ̅ ϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ϣⲟⲡ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲧ̅ⲣⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧ̅ⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲧ<ⲟⲩ>ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲛⲟ̅ⲃⲉ (7,12–17)

---

[31] Stobaeus parallels GMary to an extent, stating that passion is παρὰ φύσιν (Stobaeus 2.88.8). A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers: Translations of the Principal Sources with Philosophical Commentary* Vol. 1. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 411. Quoted in Tuckett, *Mary*, 144.

[32] 'Passionlessness dominates much of Clement's writing', Eric Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 239.

[33] For other interpretations not referenced here, including Clement, Philo, Irenaeus and the Valentinians, see Benjamin H. Dunning, 'What Sort of Thing Is This Luminous Woman? Thinking Sexual Difference in On the Origin of the World', *JECS* 16, no. 1 (2009): 65–73. Clement understands that all of humankind are in the image of God, but not all are in the likeness, as being in the likeness is sharing in the redemption of Christ (being 'Christ-like'), see Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 233–36.

[34] Alternatively, in ApJohn, 'image' refers to the image of the divine (understood in light of Gen 1.26) whereas 'likeness' refers to the 'flawed mimicry of Yaldabaoth's realm'. When the archons want to create Adam, they say: 'Let us create a human being according to the image of God and according to our likeness' (ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲛ̅ⲉⲓⲛⲉ [ₙₕ𝒸₂ 15,16–19]). See King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, esp. 100. Tuckett writes, 'the reference to the "offspring" of matter "not having a form"' in GMary 'may be a cryptic reference to the production by Wisdom of the demiurge Ialdabaoth', Tuckett, *Mary*, 145. However, the extant GMary shows no knowledge of the Sophia myth, and a difference between image and likeness could be asserted apart from this myth.

'What is the sin of the world?' The Saviour said, 'Sin does not exist but you make sin when you do the things that are like the nature of adultery, which is called sin.'

Jesus continues, stating that it is because of this that the Good came to dissolve Matter (A2), followed by: 'This is why you are si[c]k and you die, for [. . . . .] of the one who [. . . . . . who]ever understands, let him understand' (ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲓ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲱ[ⲛ]ⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲧ[. . . . .] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲣ̄ . ⲡ̣ⲁ̣[. . . . . . ⲡ]ⲉ̣ⲧ[ⲣ̄]ⲛⲟⲓ̈ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓ [7,21–8,2]). A number of letters are damaged beyond reconstruction, but sin is clearly linked with sickness and death.

It has been suggested that Peter's question is an echo of John 1.29, 'the sin of the world' (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου).[35] In John, the Baptist is talking about Jesus coming to take away sin. In GMary, Peter is asking about the nature of sin. The fact that Jesus appears to deny the existence of sin leads King to see this dialogue within the context of intra-Christian debate, and to argue that it is 'another attempt to counter a Christology that was deemed unacceptable… [S]ince sin does not exist, atonement is unnecessary'.[36] But sin does exist, and it is the reason that the cosmos must be dissolved. Sin does not exist without passion, but passion has been born from Matter, and succumbing to this passion is to act in the way of adultery.

The Soul is associated with adultery in other early Christian literature, such as AuthTeach and ExegSoul. In ExegSoul, when the personified Soul enters the body, she is riddled with a life of promiscuity, and the author casts her in the role of a prostitute and sex slave. She is trapped in this lifestyle, unable to resist the adulterers who deceive, use and leave her. Their pull is too strong, and even when she turns away from those adulterers, she runs to others (ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲉⲥϣⲁ(ⲛ)ⲕⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲥϩⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲙⲟⲓⲭⲟⲥ ϣⲁⲥⲡⲱⲧ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ([128,8–9]). ExegSoul uses biblical passages to explain its understanding of the Soul on earth; for example, the text cites Ezekiel, with regard to being a prostitute for the sons of Egypt (16.26 LXX), representing the domain of the flesh, including food, wine, oil, clothing and 'other external nonsense ' (ⲧⲕⲉϥⲗⲟⲓⲁⲣⲓⲁ [130,26]) that the Soul thinks that she needs. Entrapment by Matter is also a theme in AuthTeach: When the divine Soul is embodied, she enters into a mixed state, becoming a sibling to lust, hatred and envy, and gaining a material soul. If she chooses the wrong path, she will forget her heavenly siblings and Father (24,17–

---

[35] Tuckett, *Mary*, 141; King, *Mary*, 127; de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 23.
[36] King, *Mary*, 127.

20). Using the Word (ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ), the Soul must fight against Matter, which wishes to make her blind (27,27–33).[37] ExegSoul and AuthTeach stand in contrast to GMary as they cast the material realm and passions as intrinsically connected. AuthTeach states that the material realm is the tool of the Devil (ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲕⲉⲓⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ; ⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ [30,6; 30,27]). In GMary, Matter existed before it produced passions, and therefore the material realm and the body can be distinguished from these passions. It is possible that ExegSoul and AuthTeach represent a different trajectory of Christian thought in which matter itself is corrupt; it is the produce of the demiurge and the playground of the devil. GMary's cosmos is infused with passions that disturb the body, but construed in a way that is perhaps more Pauline than demiurgical and dualistic.

Indeed, the link between passions, sin and death, and the potential to overcome them through Christ, is a point at which GMary's theology seems closely related to Pauline thought. As Paul writes in Rom 7.5, 'While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death' (ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ). This fleshly and sinful existence can be overcome by having Christ within: 'For if Christ is in you, though the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is life because of righteousness' (εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην [Rom 8.10]). This discourse is paralleled in Galatians, where Paul juxtaposes the desire of the flesh with the Spirit (5.17), linking flesh with the law (5.18), death and passions: 'And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires' (οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις [5.24]). In these examples, Paul understands passions as sin (associated with sexuality and adultery, as in Rom 1.26–27), leading to death. In GMary, passions and sin affect the Soul, but can be countered by following Christ and having him within (8,18–20).

The Pauline connections to GMary are understood in a different way by Pasquier and King who use Rom 7 to understand sin in relation to the law. As Jesus says in his farewell discourse, disciples must not make laws or they may be dominated by them (8,22–9,4). In

---

[37] Tervahauta analyzes GMary and AuthTeach in comparison, noting that for both texts 'life is a mixed condition where passions disturb the life of the soul', but that ultimately these ideas are common and derive from Plato, Ulla Tervahauta, *A Story of the Soul's Journey in the Nag Hammadi Library: A Study of Authentikos Logos (NHC VI,3)*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 107 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 142.

Pasquier's exegesis, domination under the law in Rom 7.3–4 is compared with adultery and enslavement to passion (cf. GMary 7,14–16); being free from the law equates to joining another (Rom 7.3–4), which in GMary represents finding the Son of Man within and freeing oneself of the material world (GMary 8,18–20); and in Rom 7.6 this freedom indicates the new existence and the overcoming of the dominance of death (GMary 9,2–4). Furthermore, in the absence of the law, sin no longer exists (GMary 7,13–14; Rom 7.8).[38] But, in GMary, the question of sin is surrounded by the discourse on the dissolution of Matter, not the law. It is followed by the explanation that passion is contrary to human nature, and so it should be read in this context[39] – it is still comparable to Paul, but with a different emphasis.[40] Although making rules and laws is prohibited in GMary, it is not necessarily connected to sin.

In GMary, the construction of the cosmos, its dissolution and the reasons for it all share elements with other early Christian texts, including the Pauline corpus, the Synoptics, GThom and ApJohn, as well as later Nag Hammadi texts such as ExegSoul and AuthTeach. Matter is the raw material of the cosmos, which encompasses the lower heavens and the earth. The cosmos must be dissolved due to the disturbance that has arisen from the unnatural production of passion. These passions affect the Soul and cause sin and death. The dissolution is not a catastrophic destruction of the world nor a creation of a new world, but the restoration into its pre-formed state.

4.2. The Role of Christ

Despite the fundamental differences between synoptic eschatology and GMary's protologically-oriented dissolution of Matter, they have in common the idea that Christ is at the centre of the eschaton. In GMary, A1 appears to refer to a process of natural, inevitable dissolution of created Matter (as in GThom 11 and 111, quoted above); but A2 explains that the dissolution is dependent on 'the Good'.

---

[38] Pasquier, *Marie*, 14–17.

[39] *Contra*, Tuckett: 'the question, with the reference to the sin 'of the world', is artificial. It does not arise out of the immediately preceding discourse, but is simply a literary device to enable the teaching of Jesus to progress to the next stage', Tuckett, *Mary*, 141.

[40] See King, *Mary*, esp. 121–24.

4.2.1. *The Good and the Parousia*

Pasquier sees an entropy idea in GMary, stating that 'à la fin, par un mouvement d'auto-destruction, la nature hylique se dissoudra donc dans ses racines'.[41] But the ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ in A2 shows that the dissolution-restoration of Matter may not be *self*-destruction, but rather subject to an external agent. To repeat:

> ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟ(ⲛ) ϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲉ ϣⲁ ⲛⲁ ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ
> ⲉϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ) ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ (7,17–20)
>
> This is why the Good came into your midst to the things of every nature; so as to restore it inward to its root.

'The Good' most likely refers to the Saviour, just as he is later called 'the Blessed One' (ⲡⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ, 8,12).[42] GMary's eschatology is then christologically-orientated, seeing the Saviour as the instigator of the end of the created order, reading that it is 'because of' (ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ) passion and sin that the Saviour (*i.e.* 'the Good') 'came into your midst' (A2).[43] He is the

---

[41] Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie', 401. Gathercole argues for an entropy idea in GThom 11 and 111, likening it to Epicurean philosophy in which things passively dissolve into their elements, Simon Gathercole, '"The Heavens and Earth Will Be Rolled Up": The Eschatology of the Gospel of Thomas', in *Eschatologie – Eschatology. The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 2009)*, ed. Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser, and Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 298. However, this necessitates reading GThom 10 as separate from GThom 11. In GThom 11, quoted earlier, Jesus says that the heavens will pass away, with no indication of an external agent. However, in GThom 10 Jesus said: 'I have cast fire upon the world, and behold I am guarding it until it burns' (ⲁⲉⲓⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ̄ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ϯⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ` ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉϥϫⲉⲣⲟ). This may indicate that Jesus has inaugurated the dissolution of the heavens.

[42] Marjanen contends that the neuter form necessitates that the referent cannot be a person; however, it can relate to the Saviour's teaching, Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 108. King refers ἀγαθόν to some abstract 'Good' or transcendent God, King, *Mary*, 38, 51. Pasquier argues that it is a reference to the Saviour, Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie', 393–94. But Pasquier does not connect it to the dissolution of Matter. Tuckett writes, ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟ(ⲛ) is 'almost certainly [a reference] to the Saviour himself and/or his teaching', Tuckett, *Mary*, 142. Support for the reading as the Good being Jesus is found in BookThom and GThom. In BookThom, we read 'you will receive rest from the good one' (ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϫⲓ [ⲛ̄ⲟ]ⲩⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ), and in GThom 28 Jesus says: 'I stood in the midst of the world' (ⲁⲉⲓⲱϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲧ` ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ).

[43] This presumably refers to the whole Christ event: incarnation, death and resurrection. No translator or exegete, to my knowledge, has ever interpreted A2 as the words of the narrator rather than the speech of the Saviour. If this sentence is the narrator's, then the Saviour does not have to be referring to himself, which might appear slightly odd – though not unheard of for Jesus. As the words of the narrator, A2 is emphasizing, through repetition, the Saviour's words concerning dissolution (A1). The textual reasons for understanding these words as belonging to the narrator include the words that follow this sentence: 'Then he continued and said, "This is why you are [sic]k and you die…"' (ⲉⲧⲓ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲱ[ⲛ]ⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ [7,21–22]), which must refer to sin. If the Saviour had not ended his speech at the discussion of sin it would read that the Good is the cause of sickness and death. My reading of Jesus' speech is more natural: 'you make the sin when you do the things like the nature of adultery which is called sin… This is why you are sick and die'.

lamb that takes away the 'sin of the world' (although the sacrificial element is not explicitly present) by dissolving-restoring the material cosmos to its 'root'.

The Good has already come (ⲁϥⲉⲓ) and in GMary there is explicit criticism of the idea of his return. In early Christianity, 'Son of Man' language is often found within the context of apocalyptic eschatology rooted in Parousia theology, but in GMary the title is used within Jesus' farewell discourse, and in polemic against those who profess him as a future being:

ⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲙⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲣ̄ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓ̈ⲥⲁ ⲏ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϣⲟⲡ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲉϩⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϭⲛ̄ⲧϥ (8,15–21)

Beware, do not allow anyone to lead you astray saying, 'Look in this direction, or look in this place'. For the Son of Man exists within you. Follow him. Those who seek him will find him.

This saying is intertextually connected with Matt 24.23–27 // Mark 13.21–26, which warns against believing those that profess the Χριστός to be in the wilderness, etc., for (γάρ) the Son of Man is coming as the lightning flashes. Whether or not this exact parallel is intentional, the language used in GMary explicitly positions the text in contradiction of an eschatological expectation of Jesus' coming.[44]

The evangelist's primary interest in the Son of Man saying is to encourage her readers to find him within themselves. The internalization of the divine is comparable to what we find in Luke 17.20–23 and GThom 3 and 113:

Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν, Ἰδοὺ ὧδε: ἤ, Ἐκεῖ: ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν… καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν, Ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ: [ἤ,] Ἰδοὺ ὧδε: μὴ ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ διώξητε. (Luke 17.20–21, 23)[45]

---

[44] Tuckett writes of 'effectively a *denial* of any eschatological expectation', Tuckett, *Mary*, 153.

[45] Tuckett deems Luke 17.23 as 'all but verbatim' in GMary, Tuckett, *Mary*, 152. He writes: 'The *Gospel of Mary* is closer to the Lukan version in being unspecific about the nature or identity of any false figures: thus Mark and Matthew both have Jesus warn about people saying "Look, here is the Christ", where Luke has the simpler "Look here, look there"…. Specific talk about the "Son of Man" here in the *Gospel of Mary* would be more readily explicable as having been influenced by the Gospel of Luke if the previous parallel is also seen as related to the wording of Luke 17.23 … Luke 17.21 (which is at least as open to an interpretation about the presence of the kingdom) comes just before, and the reference here to "Son of Man" could be engendered by the

Once Jesus was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, and he answered, 'The kingdom of God is not coming with things that can be observed nor will they say, "Look here or there". For, in fact, the kingdom of God is within you[46]… They will say to you, "Look there or look here". Do not go; do not set off in pursuit.'

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲉⲩϣⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛⲉⲧ'ⲥⲱⲕ ϩⲏⲧ'ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲧ'ⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ϩⲛ̅ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲉⲓⲉ ⲛ̅ϩⲁⲗⲏⲧ' ⲛⲁⲣ̅ ϣⲟⲣⲡ' ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ ϫⲉ ⲥϩⲛ̅ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲉⲉⲓⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲃⲧ' ⲛⲁⲣ̅ ϣⲟⲣⲡ' ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲥⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ϩⲟⲩⲛ' ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲃⲁⲗ (GThom 3)

Jesus said, 'If your leaders say to you, "Look the kingdom is in the sky", then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, "It is in the sea", then the fish will precede you. Rather, the kingdom is within you and it is outside you.'[47]

ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲥⲛ̅ⲛⲏⲩ ⲛ̅ⲁϣ ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲛ̅ⲛⲏⲩ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩϭⲱϣⲧ' ⲉⲃⲟⲗ' ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲥⲁ ⲏ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲧⲏ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ' ⲉⲥⲡⲟⲣϣ' ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓϫⲙ̅ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ (GThom 113)

His disciples said to him, 'On what day will the kingdom come?' 'It will not come by watching (for) it. It will not be said, "Look here" and "look there"; rather, the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth and people do not see it.'

Luke's ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and GThom's ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ is likely to be equivalent to GMary's 'the kingdom of the Son of Man' (ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ [9,9–10]), and so these three texts recognize the kingdom to be (at least partly) within. Luke and GThom 3 allow both to be possible, and may not stand in contradiction of a Parousia theology. GThom 113, on the other hand, is actively against the future expectation.[48] It is not 'within' the disciples, but it is

---

references to the day of the Son of Man in the same context in Luke 17.22, 24, 26' (59–60). However, the evangelists are focusing in different directions – as King writes, although Luke's language is similar to GMary, the former focuses on the presence of God's realm whereas the latter is concerned with the Son of Man, King, *Mary*, 102–3.

[46] ἐντὸς ὑμῶν has been subject to a number of translations: 'in your midst', 'among you' and 'within you'. For modern interpreters who take ἐντὸς ὑμῶν to mean 'inside you', see George Raymond Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 101; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 2: 9:51–24:53*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996), 1415; François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Donald S. Deer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013), 516. Goodacre considers the 'oddity' of this phrase in Luke to point towards a direct link with GThom, Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels*, 35–36.

[47] The Greek of GThom 3 appears to have a modifier: Gathercole reconstructs ἡ βασ[ιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] as it is a better fit than 'kingdom of God', Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 208.

[48] Gathercole writes that the kingdom in GThom 113 is not in a specific place, and the 'consummation of the kingdom was still expected', Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 604. However, he writes on logion 3 that

present. Schröter regards GMary as standing with GThom 113 in correcting the future expectation.[49]

On the whole, GThom places greater emphasis on the present reality of the kingdom;[50] and, as Gathercole writes, this 'bring[s] out what is already there in some other Jesus traditions, such as Luke 4:21 and Luke 17:20–21'.[51] However, according to Popkes, GThom takes the realized eschatology a step beyond Luke, implying a confrontation with emerging Christian Parousia traditions. He notes logion 51 in particular:

ⲡⲉⲝⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ' ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲧⲏⲥ ⲝⲉ ⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ' ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲃ̄ⲃ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛⲏⲩ ⲡⲉⲝⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲝⲉ ⲧⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϭⲱϣⲧ' ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲏⲧⲥ̄ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ (GThom 51)

His disciples said to him, 'When will the rest for the dead take place and when will the new world come?' He said to them, 'What you are looking forward to has come, but you do not recognize it.'

Popkes argues that by placing a traditional expectation in the mouths of the disciples and with Jesus refuting them, '[d]ie Erwartung einer zukünftigen "neuen Welt" wird somit zurückgewiesen. Die argumentative Entfaltung dieses Logions scheint dabei eine Auseinandersetzung mit einem gegensätzlichen frühchristlichen Parusie- und Auferstehungsverständnis zu implizieren'.[52]

The use of 'Son of Man' language in GMary corresponds to the hostility towards a Parousia theology that Popkes sees in GThom. But, for GMary, it is not as simple as an explicit *denial* of a Parousia figure – the Good acts in the way that the Parousia does (to

---

GThom is 'against the *localisation* of the kingdom of God in some particular heavenly or earthly sphere… the kingdom, then, is simultaneously all around as well as within', Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 209–11. Hogeterp argues for an already/not yet eschatology in GThom, Albert L. A. Hogeterp, 'The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus: The Case of Eschatology', in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*, ed. A. Hilhorst and G. H. van Kooten, AGJU 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 394. DeConick suggests that the internal kingdom is a later development, writing that between 100 and 120CE Christians transformed the 'imminent Kingdom into the immanent kingdom', DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation*, 7.

[49] Jens Schröter, 'Zur Menschensohnvorstellung im Evangelium nach Maria', in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996. Band 2 Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*, ed. Stephen Emmel et al. (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 1999), 182.

[50] See esp. Hogeterp, 'The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus: The Case of Eschatology', 396.

[51] Gathercole, 'The Eschatology of the Gospel of Thomas', 284.

[52] Enno Edzard Popkes, 'Von der Eschatologie zur Protologie: Transformationen apokalyptischer Motive im koptischen Thomasevangelium', in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie*, ed. Michael Becker and Markus Öhler, WUNT II 214 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 217–18.

dissolve the world).[53] If the Good has come to dissolve the cosmos, then the one to inaugurate the eschaton is not a future Christ coming on the clouds, but the Jesus that the disciples are conversing with (whether the Good is understood as the incarnated or resurrected Jesus is not specified). Although the internalizing of the Son of Man is present in GMary (associated with 'gnosticism' but also found in Clement and Origen[54]), this is not exclusively the case – the external Christ has come to restore Matter (and the Soul), but this is not predicated on his coming again.[55]

4.2.2. *The Son of Man Within*

As the Son of Man will not be coming again in GMary, the question that follows is: How are we to understand the Son of Man in this gospel? Just as the canonical Son of Man has been subject to much debate, there is a lack of consensus regarding how we should interpret it in GMary.[56] Pasquier, Marjanen, King and Hartenstein contend that GMary's Son of Man is the archetypal human or the spiritual essence of humanity located within the self, and thus the name is never used to refer to Christ.[57] Pasquier specifically contrasts this with the apocalyptic Son of Man of the canonical gospels,[58] and Marjanen and King state that it is a 'clear Gnostic reintepretation'.[59] Conversely, Perkins argues that GMary's Son of Man image stems from Philonic and 'gnostic' Genesis exegesis, rather than a reinterpretation of the canonical sayings. She sees the concept of the Son of Man in the canonical gospels as so different from the heavenly Man–Son of Man image in 'gnostic' writings that it 'cannot be

---

[53] In NT studies, 'Parousia' is understood as the return of Christ at the end of the world, but it also means 'presence' and is taken in a number of ways in the Patristic world; see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1043b–1044a.

[54] The internalizing of the Parousia in 'gnosticism' is argued by Malcolm L. Peel, 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament', *NovT* 12, no. 2 (1970): 141–65. For Clement and Origen, see Jeffrey S. Siker, 'The Parousia of Jesus in Second- and Third-Century Christianity', in *The Return of Jesus in Early Christianity*, ed. John T. Carroll (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), 147–67.

[55] On the importance of a Second Coming in the NT see A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament*, NovTSupp 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1966). It also features heavily in EpAp and ApocPet, as seen in chapter one.

[56] A good starting point for this debate concerning biblical material is Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[57] Pasquier, 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie', 61–62; Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 108; King, *Mary*, 102; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 129 n.9, 144. Pasquier bases this interpretation on Eugnostos and SophJesChr in which the Son of Man is an aeon identified with Christ. Also, Tuckett: 'the Son of Man is all but a cipher for the true humanity which is attainable by all who recognize their origins and their true destiny', Tuckett, *Mary*, 63 n.22.

[58] Pasquier, *Marie*, 62.

[59] King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', 606; Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 108.

the source for its appearance in gnostic texts'.[60] Schröter, on the other hand, argues that GMary is pushing in a Johannine direction: The Son of Man in John 3.13 has come from heaven (a Parousia has taken place). Through participation in him, he enables the disciple to gain eternal life.[61] De Boer takes the John/GMary similarity further, reading κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς in John 17.26 as showing that the exalted Son of Man can live 'within his disciples'.[62]

In GMary, finding the Son of Man within corresponds to putting on the Perfect Man (ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ϯϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ [18,15–16]; ενδυσαμενο[ι] τον τ[ελειο]ν ⲁ̄ⲛ̄ⲟ̄ⲛ̄ [PRyl 21,9–10]), which Levi instructs the others to do at the end of the gospel.[63] These are clearly christological titles, related also to Mary's praise of the Lord for making the disciples 'Men' (ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ [9,20]; ⲁ̄ⲛⲟ̄[ⲩ̄ⲥ̄] [POxy 12]).[64] The Son of Man in GMary then takes up the Johannine idea that the Son of Man is present and can dwell within, but pushes this in a (deutero-)Pauline direction as the Perfect Man (Col 1.28; Eph 4.13) can be 'put on' (ϯ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ) (Rom 13.14; Gal 3.27). The Perfect Man is Christ, and the 'making us into Men' refers to making us Christs (hence the nomen sacrum[65]).

The idea of putting on the Perfect Man-Christ is explicit in GPhil:

ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲉⲓ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲫⲉⲥⲑⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ (GPhil 55,11–14)

When Christ came, the Perfect Man, he brought bread from heaven so that man would be nourished with the food of Man.

The tractate later states that Jesus Christ is 'a Blessed One' (ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ) for the very reason that he is 'a Perfect Man' (ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ) (80,1–4). This language further parallels the

---

[60] Pheme Perkins, 'Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament', *CBQ* 43, no. 4 (1981): 593. Presumably this includes GMary's use of Son of Man language, as Perkins classifies GMary as 'gnostic', as seen in chapter one.
[61] Schröter, 'Zur Menschensohnvorstellung', 178–88.
[62] de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary*, 28.
[63] Levi's final instructions mirror the Saviour's farewell discourse (Son of Man/Perfect Man → preach the gospel → no other laws [8,18–9,4; 18,15–21]), and so Levi's putting on the Perfect Man is a clear echo of the Saviour's Son of Man within. Most interpreters agree with this parallel, e.g. Pasquier, *Marie*, 100; Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 118; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 129, 151; King, *Mary*, 60–61; Tuckett, *Mary*, 192. The Greek ενδυσαμενο[ι] indicates that they have already put on the Perfect Man, just as in the Coptic Mary says that the Saviour has already made them Men (BG 9,20).
[64] GPhil shows that these titles were used for Christ, see Hugo Lundhaug, *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul*, NHMS 73 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 170.
[65] Cf. Tuckett comments on the 'surprising' occurrence of ἄνθρωπος as a nomen sacrum, stating that it 'is used here in a highly charged sense, referring to the true or "real" humanity', Tuckett, *Mary*, 82. Cf. Christopher Tuckett, '"Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?', in *Biblical Canons*, ed. J. M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 431–58.

Perfect Man in GMary (in which he is also called the Blessed One [8,12]) with Jesus. And in GPhil, it is through becoming children of the Perfect Man (ⲛ̅ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ) that one can avoid death (58,20–22). This can be done through the ritual act of drinking the eucharistic cup:

> ϩⲟⲧⲁ(ⲛ) ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲥⲱ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ
> ⲡⲉ ϣϣⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲛ̅ϯϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ (75,19–22)
> Whenever we drink this we will receive the Perfect Man. The living water is a body.
> It is necessary for us to put on the Living Man.

The Living Man and the Perfect Man can only be equated. As Lundhaug writes, 'becoming a perfect man is a primary goal for the Christian, and must be understood in terms of the overall goal of becoming a Christ'.[66] In GMary, Mary states that Jesus has made the disciples into 'Men' – presumably having the same connotations as drinking the eucharistic cup in GPhil.[67]

GMary also mentions the Son of Man with reference to the gospel of his kingdom: 'How shall we go to the nations and preach the gospel of the kingdom of the Son of Man?' (ⲛⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̅ϩⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ϣⲁ ⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ [9,7–10]). As the Son of Man is Christ, there is not a great deal of difference between Christ within and his kingdom. The Son of Man within is the internal kingdom, as we find in Luke and GThom. Luke 17.20–21, GThom 3 and GThom 113 follow the same structure as GMary (and Matt 24.26–27), with the warning that some will profess the Messiah/Son of Man/Kingdom (of God) to be in a certain place followed by the revelation of the real location, and these passages also stand alongside GMary's soteriological message by allowing the kingdom to be (at least) partly realized.

---

[66] Lundhaug, *Images of Rebirth*, 247.
[67] DeConick sees a eucharistic background to GMary, April D. DeConick, *Holy Misogyny: Why the Sex and Gender Conflicts in the Early Church Still Matter* (New York and London: Continuum, 2011), 140–41. A baptismal background is more likely in view of the language of 'putting on' Christ (Gal 3.27). Furthermore, Rom 6.3–4, Eph 2.1–6 and Col 3.1–4 understand baptism as the experience of undergoing death and attaining eternal life, and in the next chapter I will propose that GMary has an element of realized salvation.

Conclusion

The cosmic eschatology of GMary should be read protologically and christologically. Christ has come to restore the material cosmos to its pre-moulded configuration. In this chapter, I have shown that Matter has been moulded into every nature, form and creature (the created heavens and earth). But Matter unnaturally created passions – a malevolent presence that affects the Soul, causing sin and death, and the reason that the cosmos must be dissolved into its 'root'. The destruction-restoration takes place at the hand of Christ: sin and death are the reason that 'the Good' (Jesus) has come into the world. The 'Good' is linked also with the 'Son of Man' that resides within humanity. Both are Jesus. The christological element in GMary does not stand poles apart from other gospel literature but lies on the same trajectory as Luke and GThom, but with Pauline underpinnings. It does not reject the identification of the Son of Man with Jesus himself, although it does reject an eschatological expectation of his future coming. GMary does not deny the synoptic idea of a cosmic eschaton, but radically reinterprets it. There is no expectation of a future external figure, nor need there be one: with Christ's coming, the end time has broken in. The Son of Man is within; the Good dissolves the cosmos; and Christ is both. He has come (ⲁϥⲉⲓ) and will restore (ⲉϥⲛⲁⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ) the cosmos to its original state. He also facilitates the ascent of the Christian Soul to heaven, to which we will now turn.

Chapter Five

The Journey of the Soul: The Individual Eschatology of the *Gospel of Mary*

In the second eschatological revelation in GMary, Mary reveals the possibility of human salvation, telling her brothers about Jesus' ascension (cf. John 20.18) and how to follow him. She recalls a narrative of the journey of a personified Soul through four powers (ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ) that challenge her on her way to Rest. The ascent of the Soul is connected to the dissolution of Matter – both return to their origins, instigated by the incarnation, resurrection or ascension of Christ.[1]

In the ancient world, individual salvation was a more pressing issue than cosmic dissolution. As seen in chapter one, *all* dialogue gospels are concerned with the fate of the human; few with the end of the world. In the extant GMary, the teaching on the individual Soul is more extensive than the few words on the dissolution of Matter (although this may not have been the case in the full text). It begins with Mary's vision and ends with Mary mirroring the Soul as she reaches her eschatological destination. However, individual eschatology is woven throughout the gospel, and is especially prominent in the idea of finding the Son of Man/Perfect Man within, as discussed in the last chapter.

The journey of the Soul in GMary illustrates the text's multifaceted cultural background; prominent resemblances are found in Platonic texts and the 'Orphic' gold tablets. This chapter takes these into account, while still building on the work of the previous chapters by situating GMary in an early Christian context. Mary receives private revelation from Jesus, as in John 20; the descent and ascent of the Soul is the descent-ascent of the Jesus who creates a way for the disciples to follow; the Soul must ascend through a Pauline cosmos of powers and principalities; and at the end the Soul finds Rest and restoration, common eschatological motifs in Christian discourse.

---

[1] It has been proposed in earlier, more source-critical, scholarship that the ascent of the Soul was interpolated into the existing narrative of GMary. However, Peter's and Andrew's objections to Mary's teaching demonstrate the author's/editor's awareness of the 'strangeness' of the teaching to the point that it actually fits the entire narrative perfectly. On the disunity of GMary, see Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften*, 26; Henri-Charles Puech and Beate Blatz, 'The Gospel of Mary', in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 344; R. McL. Wilson, 'The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary', *NTS* 3, no. 3 (1957): 240; Pasquier, *Marie*, 7–10.

5.1. The Vision

In the middle of the Coptic GMary, pages 11–13 are missing. Just before the lacuna, Peter asked Mary to disclose what she remembers about the Saviour, and the final passage on page 10 is the beginning of Mary's report:

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϫⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ϫⲉ ⲁ{ⲓ}ⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲉⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ⲁⲧⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲓⲙ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲉϩⲟ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ <ϩⲙ̄> ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ <ⲏ> ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲉⲧϣ[ⲟⲡ] ϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ[ϥ ⲡⲉⲧ]ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁⲩ[ⲱ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡ[ⲉⲧ . . . (10,9–22)

And she began to say to them these words: 'I', she said, 'I saw the Lord in a vision and I said to him, "Lord, I saw you today in a vision". He answered and said to me, "Blessed (are) you for you did not waver as you saw me. For where the mind is, there is the treasure." I said to him, "Lord, now the one who sees the vision, does he see it through the Soul or the Spirit?" The Saviour answered and said, "He sees not through the Soul nor through the Spirit, but the Mind, which is between the two. [It is that which] sees the vision an[d] it is that [which . . .

Mary provides no context for the vision – *when* she sees it or *where* she sees it. Instead, the focus is on *how* she sees it.[2] It is possible that *when* and *where* are answered through the intertextual connection with John 20, in view of the corresponding vocabulary and characters. In John, the risen Lord appears to Mary Magdalene outside the tomb in which he was laid (20.14). At first Mary does not recognize him and asks if he knows where Jesus' body has been taken (20.15). When Jesus speaks to her, she acknowledges that he is her teacher (20.16). Jesus tells her not to touch him but instructs her to tell his brothers that he is ascending to their Father (20.17).

---

[2] The time reference 'today' (ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲟⲩ) is ambiguous. As discussed earlier, Hartenstein and King think that it could be a reference to a transfiguration-type scene, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 130, 153. King writes that this 'solves the problem of the perfect tense with the present ("I *saw* you in a vision *today*"), and the oddness of discussing the visionary experience within the vision itself', King, *Mary*, 175. But the connections to John 20 are too important to point to a ministry setting.

Mary's words in GMary 'I saw the Lord in a vision' are closely connected to Mary's words in John 'I have seen the Lord' (Ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον [20.18]) – the words she announces to the 'brothers' on Jesus' command. In both gospels, Mary will tell the other disciples what Jesus said to her privately – she will tell them about a heavenly ascension.[3] Furthermore, Jesus is here called 'Lord' (as opposed to Saviour elsewhere), mirroring the Johannine nomenclature.[4] The difference is that in GMary, Mary sees the Lord in a 'vision' (ϩⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ), which is often interpreted as something unusual, something seen in a dream or the mind's eye, and something that can be contested. As Tuckett writes: 'The scene here in the *Gospel of Mary* may then be an elaboration of the account in John's gospel, though with the parameters significantly shifted so that it is now in a *vision* that Mary has "seen the Lord"'.[5] But a vision is necessary for the soteriological teaching that the Lord will reveal to her – the ascending Soul can only be seen through the Mind, and through the power of a vision Mary herself can reach the heavenly state of silence and Rest.

The *how* question hints at a developed anthropology, with Soul, Spirit and Mind having clear but distinct functions. The question about how one sees a vision reflects the question that Paul cannot answer in 2 Cor 12:

> οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν ὅτι ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι (2 Cor 12.2–4)
>
> I know a person in Christ who, fourteen years ago, was caught up to the third heaven, whether in the body or out of the body I do not know – God knows. And I know that such a person – whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows – was caught up into Paradise and heard inexpressible words that no person is permitted to speak.

---

[3] See D'Angelo, 'I Have Seen the Lord', 95–122.
[4] See Petersen, *Zerstört die Werke*, 135.
[5] Emphasis original. Tuckett, *Mary*, 170.

In 2 Cor 12, the question of whether the vision[6] was in or out of the body is just one example of the ongoing distinction between different types of ascent.[7] Other dialogue gospels also engage with the question of different types of vision. In DialSav, Jesus refers to the great vision of 'the Eternal Existent' (ⲉⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ [137,10]). The disciples want to see it and Jesus asks whether they would like to do so through a 'transient vision or an eternal (vision)' ([ⲟ]ⲩϩⲟⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲥⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲥϥ ϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϩⲟ[ⲣⲁⲥ]ⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ [137,14–16]). Koester and Pagels argue that these differentiated types of vision belong to different stages of the Christian experience: the disciples have already received the transient vision, partly through baptism and initiation, whereas the eternal vision is reserved for the eschatological future.[8]

In GMary, Mary wants to know how she sees the vision, and Jesus likens the 'Mind' to 'treasure'.[9] With regard to the mind seeing the vision, we also find this in AscIsa, which twice states that it is Isaiah's *mind* which is taken up during the vision (6.10, 11); in ApocPaul_COP it is the mind (ⲛⲟⲩⲥ) which must awaken to see the vision (19,10–14);[10] and in AuthTeach, the Soul's bridegroom 'applied the word to her [the Soul's] eyes as a medicine to make her *see with her mind* and perceive her kinsmen and learn about her root' (ⲁϥϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲁϩⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥ̄ⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲥⲩⲅⲅⲉⲛⲏⲥ · ⲛ̄ⲥϫⲓ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ([22,26–30]). The function of the mind in AuthTeach is comparable to GMary as it is through the Mind that the Soul will learn about her root. AuthTeach also has the mind-treasure link, stating that the Soul's treasure (ⲁϩⲟ) is in the same place as her mind (ⲛⲟⲩⲥ) (28,24–26). Treasure comes in the ability to perceive one's origins. In each of these texts, it is possible that the mind is understood as the most accessible human faculty, and without the mind there would be no knowledge of the eschatological destination.

---

[6] Paul states that he writes of ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου (v.1). Most commentators read κυρίου as a subjective genitive: The Lord is the source not the content of the revelation. See William Baird, 'Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1–5 and Gal 1:11–17', *JBL* 104, no. 4 (1985): 659. This makes sense as the content of the revelation cannot be spoken about.

[7] Collins makes an interesting point: 'The reader of Paul's letter, however, might have been aware that the Jewish tradition was more familiar with in-body experience, whereas the Hellenistic tradition was more familiar with out-of-body experiences', Raymond F. Collins, *Second Corinthians*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013), 237.

[8] S. L. Emmel, Helmut Koester, and Elaine Hiesey Pagels, *Nag Hammadi Codex III,5: The Dialogue of the Savior* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 14.

[9] On the inversion of the synoptic saying (where the treasure is, there will your heart be also) (Matt 6.21 // Luke 12.34), see Pasquier, *Marie*, 72–73; Tuckett, Mary, 171–72.

[10] Despite this connection between ApocPaul_COP and AscIsa, Himmelfarb shows how the experience of the visionary differs dramatically in the two texts, Martha Himmelfarb, 'The Experience of the Visionary and Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6–11 and the Apocalypse of Paul', *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting, Semeia* 36 (1986): 97–112.

The Mind between the Soul and the Spirit in GMary is unusual (often, the trio is Soul, Spirit and body).[11] Pasquier places Spirit in the superior position as, unlike the Soul, it is unaffected by the passions. Still, she writes, the Spirit 'besoin[s] d'être réveillee'.[12] She argues that the Soul and the Spirit, in GMary, will be reunited, as they are in ApJas, which reads that the Spirit raises the Soul, and the Soul cannot be saved without the Spirit (11,38–12,5). In GMary, however, there is no real indication that the Spirit needs to be awakened, nor that it already resides in the heavens. The extant text preserves the conclusion of the Soul's journey, and there is no mention of the Spirit. Instead, she finds silence and Rest.

It is impossible to know what once followed the end of page 10, but it is possible that an explanation of the Mind and the Spirit was given. Hartenstein proposes that page 11 began with another line about the Mind, but further questions from Mary would cause a change in topic.[13] The topics, however, have probably already been introduced in Mary's question about what sees the vision. Half of page 14 must have been the dialogue between the Soul and the first power. The top of that page may have been an explanation of the journey of the Soul. This leaves pages 11 to 13 to explain the Mind and the Spirit. It is also possible that the Soul's origins were explained, as the extant text shows that the Soul has descended from her heavenly home.

5.2. Jesus and the Soul: Descent and Ascent

5.2.1. *Whose Soul?*

The identity of the Soul in GMary is not entirely clear. With journeys into heaven, it is often difficult to determine whether the protagonist is a living visionary or a deceased spirit – and, likewise, whether the point lies in the ascent itself or in the topography of the celestial realms.[14] Tuckett argues that the Soul is the Saviour's, since, '[i]f it were Mary's soul, there would be the problem of the fact that, at the time of her report, she has not yet died and her soul detached from her body'.[15] Yet, as Mary mirrors the Soul in her silence, she undeniably

---

[11] DialSav appears to favour the soul, mind and spirit trio, but it is too fragmentary to aid interpretation of GMary.

[12] Pasquier, *Marie*, 75.

[13] Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 128.

[14] See e.g. C. Colpe, 'Die Himmelsreise der Seele ausserhalb und innerhalb der Gnosis', in *Le origini dello gnosticismo, Colloquia di Messina 13–18 aprile 1966*, ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 429–47.

[15] Tuckett, *Mary*, 174. On this topic, Hartenstein simply asks, 'spricht Jesus von seiner Seele oder von Marias oder gibt es noch ganz andere Möglichkeiten?', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 128 n.7.

shares a connection with the Soul.[16] Pasquier, alternatively, sees the ascent as 'symbolisent une expérience religieuse ou psychique', expressing transcendence.[17]

As discussed in chapter three, GMary shares narratival connections with John 20: Jesus appears to Mary alone and she later recalls her meeting to the male disciples in which she says ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον (20.18), akin to her announcement in GMary (10,10–11). The connection between John 20.18 and GMary is often noted, but at the peril of missing the connection to John 20.17:

> λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς, Μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα: πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν
>
> Jesus said to her, 'Do not hold on to me, because I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and say to them, I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.'

In GMary, Mary tells her 'brothers' (ⲥⲛⲏⲩ [9,14]) about an ascension.[18] The Rest to which the personified Soul ascends surely is the heavens in which the Father of Jesus resides. The ascending Soul of GMary is surely to be connected to the ascension of the Johannine Jesus, about which he told Mary Magdalene outside the tomb and she then told his brothers.

However, the story of the Soul's journey in GMary is not simply a narrative of Christ's ascent.[19] Mary mirrors the Soul in her silence, and Mary shares in the Soul's eschatological Rest. In the Johannine FD, Jesus declares himself 'the way, the truth and the life' (ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή [14.6]); he lays down the path for the disciples to gain access to heaven. Similarly, in DialSav, Jesus states that: 'When I came I opened the way, I taught them about the passage the elect and solitary will traverse' (ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲓⲉⲓ ⲁⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ ⲁⲉⲓⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲇⲓⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲱⲃⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ̣[ⲟⲥ] ⲛ̄ϭⲓⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲧ`ⲡ̄´ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲭⲟⲥ [120,23–26]).

---

[16] King writes, 'Mary become[s] silent, modeling in her behavior the perfect rest of the soul set free', King, *Mary*, 79.

[17] Pasquier, *Marie*, 22.

[18] Curiously, although Tuckett argues that the Soul in GMary belong to the Saviour, he nowhere refers John 20.17.

[19] John 20.17 can be read in an alternative way. Jesus tells Mary to tell her brothers ἀναβαίνω – but is she to tell them that Jesus ('I') is ascending or that 'I am ascending', referring to herself? I have chosen to translate it the traditional way (as opposed to inserting speech marks: 'say to them: "I am ascending"') so that Mary is to tell Jesus' brothers that *he* is ascending, but in the case of GMary it can be read both ways, and it is possible that GMary is exploiting this ambiguity.

The point in GMary too is to follow Jesus into heaven. As well as being a story about Jesus' ascension, it is an invitation to follow him and it thus acts also as a didactic story, much like the Soul overcoming cosmic powers in GThom 50 and 1ApocJas (_NHC_ 32,28–35,25). The dialogue prepares the disciples for their heavenly ascent.

5.2.2. *Christ's Descent*

The Soul not only ascends but has descended from the heavenly realm. After we meet the Soul following the four-page hiatus, she is immediately confronted by the second power named Desire, who says:

ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ϯⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ (15,2–4)

I did not see you descending, but now I see you ascending.

Desire mistakenly believes that the Soul belongs to the realm below (15,4–5), but the Soul corrects her:

ⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓ ⲛⲉⲉⲓϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲧ (15,6–8)

I saw you. You did not see me nor did you know me. I was to you garments and you did not recognize me.

Evidently, the Soul has descended to earth and has not been recognized on her way down. The obvious connection is to the Johannine Logos, who existed before the world but now dwells in the world in flesh, although the world does not recognize him (John 1.10, 11, 14).[20] This idea appears in a number of dialogue gospels, and is most likely in the background of GMary.

In ApJohn and EpPetPhil, the Saviour descends from above and puts on a mortal, fleshly body. In ApJohn, Jesus reveals that he entered 'the middle of the prison … which is the prison of the body' (ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϣⲧⲉⲕⲟ . . . ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϣⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲙⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ [_NHC2_ 30,18–19;

---

[20] The Ephesian author also understood Christ to have descended 'to the lower parts of earth' (τὰ κατώτερα [μέρη] τῆς γῆς; [Eph 4.9]), referring presumably to the incarnation. See Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, Paideia (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 112.

31,3–4]). And thus, Jesus was hidden from the powers of this world, 'and they did not recognize me' (ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲧ [30,21]). This idea is also found in EpPetPhil, in which Christ was sent to the cosmos below to awaken the fallen light-seed in humanity. Meyer writes, '[f]or the sake of this descent the redeemer apparently put on a body as a disguise, and went unrecognized by the cosmic powers'.[21] Similarities between EpPetPhil and John 1 include the phrase 'sent down in the body' (ⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲅⲙ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ [EpPetPhil NHC 136,17]) and 'became flesh' (σὰρξ ἐγένετο [John 1.14]), the nonrecognition of the Saviour (EpPetPhil 136,20–21; John 1.10), and coming to one's own (EpPetPhil 136,23; John 1.11).[22]

EpAp and AscIsa contain expanded versions of Christ's descent, involving not only becoming flesh, but several transformations throughout his journey in order that the heavenly powers (angels in these cases) should not recognize him. In EpAp, Jesus descends from the Father of all things, putting on the Father's wisdom and power, travels incognito through the various heavens and earth, and then becomes flesh in Mary's womb. During his descent, Jesus transforms himself into the angelic form specific to each of the seven heavens; the angels Michael, Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael follow him to 'the fifth firmament, for they were thinking in their hearts that I was one of them' (ⲁⲡⲙⲁⲅ†ⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲧⲉⲣⲉⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲅⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲅⲏⲧ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲅⲏⲧⲟⲩ [13.4]).[23] AscIsa is comparable: Christ changes his form as he descends through the seven heavens, the firmament and to earth. The purpose is disguise: 'none of the angels of that world shall know that you (are) Lord with me [the Father] of the seven heavens and their angels' (10.11). When Christ becomes flesh, 'he suckled at the breast like an infant, as was customary, that he might not be recognized' (11.17).

Although the unrecognized descending Soul of GMary is not explicitly said to be Jesus, it is highly likely that a descent-ascent christology lies behind the text. Christ descends to earth to restore all things to their origins – he inaugurates the dissolution of Matter and paves the way for souls to journey to heaven. For 1ApocJas, Perkins sees Jesus' ascent through the hostile powers as making the ascent of 'gnostic' souls possible, as by ascending through the archons 'I shall reveal to them [the archons] that he [the righteous person] cannot

---

[21] Marvin W. Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, SBLDS 53 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 130.

[22] On these parallels and more, see Klaus Koschorke, 'Eine gnostische Paraphrase des johanneischen Prologs: zur Interpretation von "Epistula Petri ad Philippum" (NHC VIII, 2) 136,16–137,4', *VC* 33, no. 4 (1979): 383–92. Meyer argues that only some of Koschorke's parallels are convincing, Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, 132–33.

[23] Hartenstein argues that the similarities between the descent in EpAp, GMary and PistSoph 8 suggest that EpAp is clearly influenced by 'gnostic' language and ideas, Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 106.

be seized' (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛ︦ϩ︦ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ [NHC 30,2–4]).[24] A comparable idea is found in EpPetPhil, in which Jesus is sent down in the body to give those who belong to him authority to enter the inheritance of his Fatherhood (NHC 136,16–28). In the passage that follows, Christ tells the apostles how to defeat the archons above (137,15–30) and that they must become illuminators (ⲫⲱⲥⲧⲏⲣ, 137,8) – the same word used for Christ (133,27; 139,15). Christ teaches the apostles how to become like him. In AscIsa, Christ descends and the ascending Christ takes the souls of the righteous with him (9.16–18).

Christ's ascent may be challenged, however, and in 1ApocJas he acknowledges that he too must confront the archons. James asks,

ϩⲣⲁⲃⲃⲓ ⲛ̄ⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ϯⲛⲁⲕⲁⲧⲁⲛⲧⲁ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲡⲉⲧˋϣⲟⲟⲡˋ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲓ̈ϭⲟⲙ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ︦ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲉⲓ ⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲓⲁ ⲉⲩϩⲏⲕ ⲟⲩⲃⲛⲉⲓ· ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ̈ϭⲟⲙ ϩⲏⲕ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲕ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲕ ⲁⲛ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩϩⲏⲕ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ϭⲉ· ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ̈ϭⲟⲙ ϩⲏⲕ ⲟⲩⲃⲛⲉⲓ … ϯⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲁⲃϩⲏⲧˋ ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲃⲱⲗ︦ⲕ̄ (NHC 27,14–21; 28,3–4). 'Rabbi, how shall I reach the One who Is when all these powers and hosts are armed against me?' He said to me, 'These powers are not armed against you only but against another: it is against me that they are armed! … I am fearful before their anger.'

Christ's victory is assured, however. 'If they seize him, then he will seize each of them' (ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ· ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲩⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ϩ︦ⲓ︦ⲭ︦ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ [NHC 30,4–6]). Similarly, in GMary the anonymous Soul who overcomes the powers is, in the first instance, Christ's, who prepares the way for those who will follow.

In all these diverse texts, we find the idea that Christ became human so that humans could become Christlike. Jesus descended from the heavens in order to ascend and pave the way for believers to follow him. As Christ will ascend, defeating the cosmic powers that stand in his way, the individual human soul can do likewise. The ascent of the soul is orientated towards Christ.

5.2.3. *The Soul's Descent*

If the individual soul, such as Mary's, can follow Christ to heaven, then she too must overcome the challenges of the archons. As we shall see in the next section, there are

---

[24] Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*, 142–43.

standard challenges in which the powers ask the Soul where she is from and where she is going, and the standard retort from the Soul is that she is from 'above'. And so, it would seem that the heavenly Rest that the Soul attains was her original state before being embodied, and that, like Christ, she too descended. The rationale of the descent of the Soul in GMary is not clear. It may have been explained in the missing pages; alternatively, the descent may simply have been accepted without explanation. ExegSoul and AuthTeach are two texts that are focused on how the embodied Soul must defeat bodily lusts and passions, and both texts accept that the Soul has 'fallen' into the body but never explain why. The Soul's descent into flesh in GMary most likely builds on the multitude of traditions that profess that (some) humans possess a divine soul.[25]

Within the extant text, we find a particular affinity to the Platonic notion of the soul's descent from rest to motion.[26] In GMary, the powers attempt to destabilize the Soul but she gains 'Rest' (ἀνάπαυσις) and 'silence' (σιγή; ⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ) at the culmination of her ascent (17,5–7 // PRyl.GM 21,2). Plato's souls always move (*Phaedr.* 245c-246a), but stability can be achieved by the souls who 'stand on the outer surface of heaven' which is devoid of disorder and disturbance (*Phaedr.* 245c-247c).[27] In the *Timaeus*, becoming stable is concurrent with overcoming the passions. Before the souls are placed in bodies, they are stable and restful; once they are bound to flesh, they are moved with passions:

> When, from necessity, they are implanted in bodies, and there is the to and fro movement of their bodies (καὶ τὸ μὲν προσίοι, τὸ δ᾽ ἀπίοι τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν), then the first necessity which would befall them is the innate sense perception common to all, which comes from violent passions (ἐκ βιαίων παθημάτων); second, desire (ἔρωτα) mixed with pleasure and grief; and added to these, fear and anger and whatever (passions) naturally go with these, along with whatever (passions) are their opposites. (*Tim.* 42a-b)[28]

---

[25] Dillon shows that 'within the Platonism of the first few centuries AD [we have] a fairly wide spectrum of doctrines concerning the descent of the soul into the body' John Dillon, 'The Descent of the Soul in Middle Platonic and Gnostic Theory', in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, March 28–31, 1978*, ed. Bentley Layton, vol. 1, Studies in the History of Religion 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 363. He argues that Christian belief in the descent of the Soul is likely to be the manifestation of the divine in the world (359).

[26] This is not to say that the Soul presented in GMary is entirely Platonic. There is no indication that the Soul of GMary is composed of three parts, one rational and two nonrational, as we find in Platonic texts such as the *Phaedrus, Republic* and *Timaeus*.

[27] See Williams, *The Immovable Race*, esp. 114.

[28] Also quoted in Williams in relation to ApJohn, *The Immovable Race*, 114–15.

It is at the beginning of the 'to and fro' movement, the movement of the soul entering into the body, that the souls will experience the power of the passions. In GMary, it is in the body that a 'disturbance' happens, caused by the passions that mirror the cosmic powers that the Soul must overcome (8,2–6).

Such Platonic ideas and language are employed in ApJohn, in which Sophia begins 'to move to and fro' (ϣⲉⲉⲓ [NHC2 13,13]; ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣ[ⲉ] [BG 45,1][29]) in distress on realizing her error as Yaldabaoth boasts that he is the only god.[30] In the text, John asks what moving 'to and fro' means, to which Jesus replies that it is not the Spirit of God being borne along (ἐπιφέρεσθαι) over the waters, as Moses said (Gen 1.2 LXX), but Sophia travelling back and forth in angst, not daring to return home (BG 45,6–19). Pleše argues that Sophia's movement refers to her yielding to the violent movement of the passions of shame, weeping and repenting.[31] This stands in contrast to the aeon of the highest Father which exists in a state of tranquillity 'at rest in silence' (ⲉϥⲙ̅ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ [BG 26,7–8]). Williams writes that the verb ἐπιφέρεσθαι 'has become a peg on which to hang the contrast between the stability of the aeonic realm and the instability of the chaotic realm of darkness'.[32] Humanity is saved when it overcomes its entrapment in the realm of movement and reaches the realm of tranquillity (Sophia too is made stable and her outpouring of passion ceases when the Spirit responds to her prayer [BG 46,15–47,14]). The language of Rest and silence is also used in GMary for the desired state of the human soul (ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ is synonymous with ⲙ̅ⲧⲟⲛ) as it escapes from the earthly sphere of disturbance, passion and motion.

In GMary, during the Soul's descent, Desire did not recognize her because she was clothed. As in the christologically-oriented descent narratives discussed above, her clothing is her disguise, and it culminates in her incarnation: ultimately, the clothing – called here ϩⲃⲥⲱ (garment) – is flesh.[33] The use of the word ϩⲃⲥⲱ, rather than ϣⲧⲉⲕⲟ (prison [e.g. ApJohn NHC2

---

[29] ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ is the Coptic-Greco word from ἐπιφέρεσθαι, and is only in the BG recension. ϣⲉⲉⲓ has the sense of wandering to and fro, Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, 547a.

[30] Williams suggests that *Tim.* 42a-b, quoted above, directly influenced the account of Sophia in ApJohn, Williams, *The Immovable Race*, 114.

[31] Zlatko Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John*, NHMS 52 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 124. Pleše sees here an amalgamation of Stoic and Platonic ideas: 'Sophia's movement of repentance combines two seemingly incompatible alternatives – it represents a particular state of mind stirred by the rational acknowledgment of evil as well as an irrational affection resulting from the soul's union with the flowing and ebbing tide of the bodily substrate'.

[32] Williams, *The Immovable Race*, 113.

[33] Tuckett, *Mary*, 181; King, *Mary*, 70. This is unlike EpAp and AscIsa, in which Christ transforms himself into the form of angels.

30,18–19]) or ⲙ̄ϩⲁⲟⲩ (tomb [e.g. ApJohn ᴮᴳ 55,10]), may suggest that the body is not a *tomb or a prison* for the soul, as in some Platonic texts (e.g. *Phaed.* 82e) and several other ancient thought patterns.[34] ϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ is a more neutral term, as is illustrated by SentSext: 'The garment of your soul [is] the body, so keep it holy since it is without sin' (ⲧϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲯⲩⲭⲏ̄ [ⲧⲉ] ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ · ⲁⲣⲏϩⲉ ϭⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϥ[ⲟⲩ]ⲁⲁⲃ · ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲛⲟⲃⲉ [30,12–14]). In GMary, 'garment' may be closer to the idea of the body, also seen in Plato, as a woven fabric that holds the soul within itself as a means to protect it (to an extent); eventually it unravels and the 'soul is then released in a natural way' (*Tim.* 73b, 74a, 81d). A similar idea is found in 'Orphism' (as reported by Aristotle), in which the body is an undemanding but brief enclosure for the soul, called a garment.[35] A less negative view of the body corresponds with the more neutral view of Matter, proposed in the previous chapter. It is not the body, made of Matter, which is the fundamental problem – it is the passions that act upon it.

5.3. Powers and Passwords

5.3.1. *The Heavens and the Gatekeepers*

During the ascent, the Soul meets four powers: the first is most likely to be named Darkness (to correspond with the first power of Wrath);[36] the second is named Desire (ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ); the third, Ignorance (ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ); and the fourth, the seven forms of Wrath (ⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ). In the extant text, Darkness, Desire and Wrath act as cosmic gatekeepers that challenge the Soul and attempt to prevent her from progressing to the next level.

Levels of heavens and their gatekeepers are another common motif in antiquity.[37] We often find three or seven heavens; GMary's four guardians for four realms with Rest above is

---

[34] In the *Chaldean Oracles*, the physical world is both a tomb and a jail which the soul must escape, ridding itself of the ὄχημα (vehicle) or χιτών (garment) that it acquired during the descent through the planetary spheres; see Brian P. Copenhaver, *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation with Notes and Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), xxv. Also, we find this in Josephus' description of Essene belief: 'They believe that the bodies are corruptible and their matter impermanent, but that the souls persevere. Coming from the finest ether, the souls become entangled in the bodies, as in prison, drawn down by some natural spell. When once they leave the bonds of the flesh, just as if released from a long slavery, then they rejoice and are lifted high in the air' (*War* 2.8.11).

[35] *On the Generation of Animals* B1 734a16, see Radcliffe G. Edmonds III, *Redefining Ancient Orphism: A Study in Greek Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 278–79.

[36] Although the first power is not met in the extant text; as Desire and Ignorance correspond to the second and third of the seven forms of Wrath (16,4–13), the first form, Darkness, is most likely the name of the first power.

[37] See esp. Simon Gathercole, 'Quis et Unde? Heavenly Obstacles in Gos. Thom. 50 and Related Literature', in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 82–101.

unusual, especially when combined with the collective seven guardians in the final power of Wrath.[38] On the other hand, seven heavens are extremely common.[39] In AscIsa, Christ and his Father reside in the seventh heaven, and Christ descends through the heavens and the lower firmament. HypArch has seven heavens controlled by Sabaoth, the son of Yaldabaoth. In ApocPaul$_{COP}$, Paul must have the appropriate sign to pass through the Old Man (the demiurge) at the seventh heaven; in ApJohn, the archons number seven.[40] For GMary, Tardieu, Pasquier and King argue that the seven powers of Wrath correspond to the astrological spheres that control fate.[41]

The narrative of seven rulers questioning the Soul is paralleled in OrigWorld:

ⲡⲥⲁϣϥ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩϣⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ̄ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲩϯ ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲓϥⲉ ⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲛⲓⲙⲁ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲉⲣⲅⲟⲛ (115,17–23)

Then when the seven rulers came, they saw him and were greatly disturbed. They went up to him and seized him. And the chief ruler said to the breath within him 'Who are you? And where did you come from?' It answered and said, 'I have come from the power of Man for the destruction of your work'.

Here, the Soul is the life-force that Sophia has sent to introduce life into Adam's newly-created body. It is neither Jesus nor a soul following Jesus, and the challenge from the archons comes at the Soul's incarnation, not its departure from the body.

---

[38] There may be a Platonic background here: the four categories of living creatures that inhabit the cosmos (*Tim.* 39e-40a) combined with the seven wandering stars.

[39] See esp. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*, Supplements to The Journal for the Study of Judaism 50 (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1996), 47–52.

[40] This number may derive from the 'young gods' (planets) in the *Timaeus*, as argued by King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, 111; Nicola Denzey Lewis, *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Under Pitiless Skies*, NHMS 81 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013), 2013. However, Pétrement regards Jewish days of the week to be a possibility, Simone Pétrement, *A Separate God: The Origins and Teachings of Gnosticism*, trans. Carol Harrison (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1984), 65. Welburn cannot accept this: 'no significant correlations result from taking the order of the weekdays as that of the Archons', see A. J. Welburn, 'The Identity of the Archons in the "Apocryphon Johannis"', *VC* 32, no. 4 (1978): 242. Collins repeatedly refers to Babylonian parallels – particularly for the literature that does not explicitly refer to planets, John Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*, 21–46.

[41] Tardieu, *Écrits Gnostiques*, 290–92; Pasquier, *Marie*, 80–86; King, *Mary*, 71.

Tuckett links the names of the seven forms of Wrath in GMary with the seven archons in ApJohn and the feminine names of the archons in OrigWorld:[42]

GMary 16,4–13	*ApJohn* 43,11–20 (BG)[43]	*OrigWorld* 101,9–102,2
ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ (Darkness)	`ⲧ´ⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ (Forethought)	ⲧⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ (Forethought)
ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ (Desire)	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ (Divinity)	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲭⲁⲉⲓⲥ (Lordship)
ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ (Ignorance)	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲭ̅ⲥ̅ (Christhood/Goodness[44])	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ (Deity)
ⲡⲕⲱϩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲙⲟⲩ (Zeal for Death)	ⲕⲱϩⲧ (Fire)	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲣ̅ⲣⲟ (Kingdom)
ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛ̅ⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ (Kingdom of the Flesh)	ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲣ̅ⲣⲟ (Kingdom)	ⲡⲕⲱϩ (Jealously)
ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲥⲁⲃⲏ ⲛⲥⲉϭⲏ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁⲣⲝ (Foolish Wisdom of the Flesh)	ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓⲥ (Understanding)	[ⲧⲙⲛⲧ]ⲣⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲟ (Wealth)
ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ [ⲛ̅]ⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ (Wisdom [of the] Wrathful Person)	ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ (Wisdom)	ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ (Wisdom)

Tuckett imagines that ⲕⲱϩⲧ (fire) in ApJohn once read ⲕⲱϩ (zeal) as in the NHC2 recension, and argues that 'the correlation between this section of the lists in the *Gospel of Mary* and in [ApJohn] (the version lying behind) BG 43 is fairly exact'.[45] He then attempts to reconstruct the history of the development of these terms and points towards a demiurge in the background of GMary. However, although these lists are comparable, their similarities should not be overstated. The names of the powers in GMary are likely to derive from traditions of vice lists that were notoriously fluid in antiquity, and the gatekeepers themselves need not represent a demiurgical tradition.[46]

---

[42] Tuckett only lists the last four in ApJohn in comparison with the last four in GMary, Tuckett, *Mary*, 176. Cf. Pasquier, *Marie*, 81.
[43] The list differs in the different recensions of ApJohn.
[44] Throughout ApJohn, the nomen sacrum ⲭ̅ⲥ̅ may derive either from Χριστός or χρηστός.
[45] Tuckett, *Mary*, 177.
[46] For an overview of vice lists, see Philip L. Tite, *Valentinian Ethics and Paraenetic Discourse: Determining the Social Function of Moral Exhortation in Valentinian Christianity*, NHMS 67 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 164–75.

The gatekeepers indicate an indirect influence from the Pauline corpus, which envisages a cosmos dominated by hostile cosmic beings. A key passage is Eph 6.12 in which the author talks of struggling against cosmic powers (πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου) and evil spiritual forces in heavenly places (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις).[47] Several early Christian thinkers shared the belief that demonic powers governed the world; for example, Tatian tells his addressees that humanity is under the influence of demons and that they should take up arms against them and conquer them by repudiating matter (*ad. Graec.* 16).[48] In the background here is, once again, Plato, who argues in the *Phaedo* that the Soul is not in harmony with the body – it is 'something much too divine to rank as an attunement' (94e) – and rather works against it, sometimes 'conversing with the desires and passions and fears (ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ὀργαῖς καὶ φόβοις) as though it were quite separate and distinct from them' (94d). The righteous soul conversing with the inner forces of the desires and passions is entirely at home in Plato; but Christian thinkers saw them as mirrored in the heavenly sphere. In GMary, the wise soul can converse with and conquer the passions and fears who act as gatekeepers on her heavenly journey, by imitating Christ's ascension.

5.3.2. *The Key to Open the Gate*

Where there are gatekeepers, there are ways in which to pass through their gates. In early Christian texts, the cosmic traveller generally has to make a verbal proclamation in response to the gatekeepers' questions in order to unlock the gates. In AscIsa, Christ himself needs to provide 'passwords' to descend through most of the lower heavens (10.24–30). (The angels of the air seem to forget to ask him for a password as they are too busy fighting each other [10.31].) And Christians, following Jesus, were learning this procedure – Origen quotes Celsus as referring to those who have 'wretchedly learnt by heart the names of the [seven] door-keepers' (*c. Cels.* 7.40, cf. 6.30). DialSav, GThom 50 and 1ApocJas demonstrate that these passwords or verbal declarations were being taught. The disciples could learn how to pass through the archons, modelled on Jesus' own ascension.

DialSav explicitly shows that these verbal pronouncements were *taught* by Jesus:

---

[47] As we saw in chapter two, Ephesians was very influential, demonstrated by its citation at the beginning of HypArch (86,20–27).
[48] Gathercole states that brief allusions to this motif are common, citing SentSext 40, ApJas 8,27–36, *Treatise on the Resurrection* 45,38–39 and *Acts of Thomas* 148, 167, Gathercole, 'Quis et Unde?', 83 n.5.

ϯ ⲛⲁⲧⲥⲁⲃⲱⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ϭⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ

ⲛⲁ ⲭ ⲧⲱⲙⲛ̄ⲧ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ · ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲣϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟ ⲭ ⲉⲓϣ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ · ⲁⲗⲗⲁ

ⲉϣⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩϭⲉⲣⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ· ⲉ . . . (122,2–8)

I will *teach* you. When the time of the dissolution arrives, the first power of darkness

will come upon you. Do not be afraid and say 'Behold. The time has come'. But

seeing a single staff . . .

Unfortunately, lacunae render a large part of the next eight lines and the following leaf

illegible. It is impossible to deduce how far these instructions continue or what Jesus taught

Mary, Matthew and Judas.

In GThom and 1ApocJas, pronouncements take the form of declaring one's origins.

As one saying in GThom reads:

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ϫⲉ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲧϥ ⲁϥϣⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲁⲩⲱ

ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉ̣[ⲃ]ⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲟⲩϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲉⲩϣⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ

ⲛⲉϥϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲡ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϫⲛⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ

ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲕⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ (GThom 50)

Jesus says: 'If they say to you, "Where do you come from?" say to them, "We have

come from the light, the place where the light has come into being by itself, has

establish[ed itself] and has appeared in their image". If they say to you, "Is it you?"

say, "We are his children, and we are the elect of the living Father". If they ask you,

"What is the sign of your Father among you?" say to them, "It is movement and

rest".'

What is actually being referred to here is unclear.[49] It has been read as taking place in a

secular environment;[50] as a dialogue between the soul and powers in preparation for mystical

---

[49] The combination of motion and rest is also difficult to interpret: DeConick turns to the *Corpus Hermeticum* to
interpret it as God's immobility, April D. DeConick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the
Gospel of Thomas*, VCSupp 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 93–95. Gathercole sees it as a divine unity, Gathercole,
The Gospel of Thomas, 410.
[50] See Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 406–07.

experience,[51] or as Jesus preparing the disciples for their post-mortem heavenly ascent.[52] The last option not only parallels the eschatological context of DialSav and GMary, but is complemented by the previous saying, in which Jesus says, 'Blessed are the solitary and elect, for you will find the kingdom. For you are from it, and you will return there again' (ϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲡ̀ ϫⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲉ ⲁⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲥ̄ ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ̀ ⲉⲙⲁⲩ [GThom 49]). In 1ApocJas and GMary, the dialogue with the powers reflects the Christian soul returning to its heavenly home, and so GThom 50 is likely to be the same.

1ApocJas has a very clear passage where Jesus is instructing James what to say to the otherworldly guardians, called toll-collectors:

ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ϭⲉ ⲉⲕϣⲁⲛⲉ̂ⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ · ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ · ⲉⲩⲣⲉϥⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ̄ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲏ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ · ⲉⲕⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ (ₙₕ꜀ 33,11–18)
When you come into their power, one of them who is their guard will say to you, 'Who are you or where are you from?' You are to say to him, 'I am a son, and I am from the Father'.

ⲉϥⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ · ⲉⲕⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲁⲓ̂ⲉ̂ⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉ̂ⲓⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲙⲁⲩ (ₙₕ꜀ 34,15–17).
When he again says to you, 'Where will you go?', you are to say to him, 'To the place from which I have come, there shall I return'.[53]

James will be saved by declaring that he is returning home.

Similar questions are posed to the Soul in GMary:

[ⲁⲥ]ⲣ̄ⲉϩⲉⲧⲁϩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲥϫ[ⲱ ⲙ̄]ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ (15,13–14)
[She] questioned the Soul, sa[yi]ng 'Where are you going?'

---

[51] DeConick, *Seek to See Him*, 43–99.
[52] Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 407; Gathercole, 'Quis et Unde?'
[53] The CT version is similar.

ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲉ ⲧⲥⲁϣϥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ̣[ⲍ̅]ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲉⲩϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩ̅ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲓⲛ ⲧⲱⲛ

ⲧϩⲁⲧⲃⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲟⲩ̣ⲁ̣ⲥ̣ϥ̣ⲙ̣ⲁ (16,12–16)

These are the seven p[o]wers of Wrath. They ask the Soul, 'Where do you come from Human-Slayer? Or, where do you go Space-Destroyer?'

The 'who are you' and 'where are you from/going' questions are widespread, being found across cultures and times.[54] But in a Christian context they may relate directly to Jesus. Looking at 1ApocJas, Haxby regards the instructions as 'reflect[ing] a complex and creative reading of John', and particularly John 7–8.[55] As Jesus teaches in the Temple, a debate breaks out regarding whether he is the Messiah.[56] The questions and answers are orientated around who Jesus is and where he is from/going.

ἀλλὰ τοῦτον οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν. (John 7.27)
Yet we know where this man is from, but when the Messiah comes, no one will know where he is from.

κἀμὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί· καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε· ἐγὼ οἶδα αὐτόν, ὅτι παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι κἀκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν. (7.28–29)
You know me and you know where I am from. I have not come of my own accord, but the one sent me is true, and you do not know him. I know him, because I am from him, and he sent me.

ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι καὶ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με. (7.33)
I will be with you a little longer and then I am going to him who sent me.

---

[54] Examples include the Egyptian 'Book of the Dead' (chap. 122) and the *Jaiminiya Brahmana* (46–50) from India. For these and more examples, see Alberto Bernabé and Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 162 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 207–26.

[55] Mikael Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James: Martyrdom and Sexual Difference' (PhD Thesis, Harvard, 2013), 67–71.

[56] As 7.53–8.11 is not part of the original text, 8.12 presumably continues in the Temple; cf. v. 59.

Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς· ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· κἂν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία μου, ὅτι οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἔρχομαι ἢ ποῦ ὑπάγω. (8.13–14)

Then the Pharisees said to him, 'You are testifying on your own behalf; your testimony is not valid'. Jesus answered, 'My testimony is valid because I know where I have come from and where I am going, but you do not know where I come from or where I am going'.

ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί· ὑμεῖς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου ἐστέ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (8.23)

You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world.

The debate over origins and destination in John 7–8 mirrors the dialogue that James must expect with the soul-collecting archons in 1ApocJas. Haxby argues:

The questions which are asked of Jesus in *John*, and which the 'guard' and 'toll collectors' pose in *1ApocJas*, concern the same issues of origin and destination. The answers are the same: just as Jesus came from God the Father, so James has come from the Father. Just as Jesus is returning to the Father, so James is going to the place from which he came.[57]

Jesus' self-knowledge in John 7–8, which authenticates his authority, is reformulated in 1ApocJas as the knowledge that James must acquire about himself: 'The Christology of *John* comes to be knowledge about the self in *1ApocJas*'.[58] And this knowledge is the path to true martyrdom and James' return to 'the place from which I have come' (ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ [CT 21,18]).[59]

---

[57] Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James', 69.

[58] Haxby, 'The First Apocalypse of James', 70.

[59] Edwards, similar to Haxby, sees the narrative of the ascent of the Soul in 1ApocJas as serving two purposes within the text: 'The first purpose is to act as a recapitulation and expansion on the earlier cosmology. More importantly, however, is the fact that this part of the narrative serves to impart instructions to the dying person on successfully navigating in the afterlife. In this context we might go so far as to assert that these instructions are intended for the believers about to be martyred', Robert Michael Edwards, 'The Rhetoric of Authority: The Nature of Revelation in the First Apocalypse of James', in *La littérature des Questions et Réponses dans*

The knowledge of one's origins as the verbal key to pass through otherworldly gatekeepers predates Christianity by centuries; we find it on the gold 'Orphic' tablets, on which the deceased must remember what path to take and what to say to the guardians as they journey into Hades.[60] These are grave tablets dating from the end of the fifth century BCE to the second century CE and have been 'found throughout the margins of the Greek world, from Thessaly to southern Italy and Crete'.[61] They functioned as mnemonic devices to aid the deceased in remembering what to say as they journey into Hades. By the nature of being a mnemonic device, and small, gold tablets, they do not offer continuous narratives about the afterlife, but Graf and Johnston argue that in the tablets 'we should expect to find brief allusions to bigger stories and ritual sequences with which their possessors were familiar'.[62] They are of interest due to the dialogue between the 'guards' and the deceased, who must declare that they are from a heavenly race:

> You will find to the left of the house of Hades a spring
>
> and standing by it a white cypress.
>
> Do not even approach this spring!
>
> You will find another, from the Lake of Memory,
>
> cold water pouring forth; there are guards before it.
>
> Say, 'I am a child of Earth and starry Sky,
>
> but my race is heavenly. You yourselves know this.
>
> I am parched with thirst and am dying; but quickly grant me
>
> cold water flowing from the Lake of Memory'.
>
> And they themselves will grant you to drink from the sacred spring.
>
> And thereafter you will rule among the other heroes.
>
> This is the work of Memory. When you are about to die
>
> to die . . .   write this

---

l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse, ed. Marie-Pierre Bussières, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64 (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013), 68–69.

[60] For a redefinition of 'Orphic' and 'Orphism' (much like the redefinition of 'gnosticism'), see Edmonds, *Redefining Ancient Orphism*. The relationship between Orphism and 'gnosticism' is 'an old conundrum of the history of religions'; see Einar Thomassen, 'Gnostics and Orphics', in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer*, ed. Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper, Studies in the History of Religions 127 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 468.

[61] Radcliffe G. Edmonds III, *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic Gold Tablets'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 29.

[62] Fritz Graf and Sarah Iles Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 95.

enwrapped . . . darkness.[63]

This tablet is one of the earliest, dated to the fourth century BCE, approximately six centuries before GMary (and 1ApocJas and GThom). As well as other tablets from the same period that follow a similar format, there are several examples from the second/first century BCE that include the question 'Who are you? Where are you from?' (τίς δ᾽ ἐΖί; πῶ δ᾽ ἐΖί), to which the person must answer that they are a son or daughter of the Earth and starry Sky.[64] In contrast to the example above, in these tablets there is no declaration that they are from a heavenly race, or the like.[65] Tablets that include a reference to the heavenly race begin with the strongly adversative αὐτάρ, which Edmonds suggests points to 'a more dualistic outlook that privileges the starry sky of Heaven over the material world of the Earth'. This is opposed to 'the original claim to be the child of both Earth and Heaven [that] implies not dualism but primeval unity'.[66]

The dialogue gospels that instruct the soul how to combat its opponents leave out much of what we find on the Orphic tablets, such as the crossroads, cypress tree and spring.[67] The idea that the dead were thirsty (which Edmonds argues is a universal human idea[68]) is common on the tablets: the dead must refrain from drinking the first body of water it comes across (from the spring of forgetfulness – they must hold out for the spring of memory). In the Christian narratives, instead of conquering thirst (and forgetfulness), the Souls must conquer passions (and forgetfulness). Both thirst and passions represent bodily desires and needs, and in both cases, failing memory has the capacity to hamper progress.

In order to gain access to the superior afterlife offered on the Orphic tablets and in 1ApocJas, one must *remember.* On several of the Orphic tablets, the dead must resist the water of forgetfulness and drink only from the spring of memory. Forgetfulness is seen as a

---

[63] Translation from Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, 6–7.
[64] E.g. Eleutherna 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; Mylopotamos; Rethymnon 2; and Pharsalos: Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, 20–35.
[65] The exception to this is tablet 29, from a grave of an unknown location in Thessaly, mid-4th cent. BCE, which reads 'Who are you? Where are you from? I am son of the Earth and starry Sky. But my race is heavenly' (τίς δ᾽ἐσί; πῶ δ᾽εσί; Γᾶς υἱος εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος· αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γένος οὐράνιον); see Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, 40–41.
[66] Edmonds III, *Myths of the Underworld Journey*, 79.
[67] Thomassen writes that there are three points of comparison between Orphism and 'gnosticism' (namely 1ApocJas and *Adv. Haer.* 1.21.5): '1) a similar scenario of [cosmic] interrogation; 2) a declaration made by the deceased about her divine origin and nature; and 3) the reference to a previous ritual of initiation which has assured the dead person of her divine nature, made her immortal and provided her with the knowledge needed to overcome the obstacles faced after death and to produce the right answers to the questions asked', Thomassen, 'Gnostics and Orphics', 467–68.
[68] Edmonds III, *Myths of the Underworld Journey*, 47.

quality of the disembodied. In 1ApocJas, however, forgetfulness hits when one becomes embodied. It is a defect of the souls trapped in the body, rather than the dead. James praises Jesus for not being subject to the folly of forgetfulness in a somewhat poetic adoration:

> ϩⲣⲁⲃⲃⲉⲓ ⲁⲕⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ [ϩⲛ] ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲉ︤ⲭ︥ⲡⲓⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕⲉⲓ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲙⲉⲟⲩⲉ
> ⲉ︤ⲭ︥ⲡⲓⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲃ︤ⲱ︥ϣⲉ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ϯϥⲓ ⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲁⲛ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲕ ⲁⲕⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
> [ⲙ̄]ⲡⲕ︤ⲧ︥ⲱⲗⲙ̄ ⲗⲁⲟⲩⲉ ϩⲣⲏ̣ⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲥ̣ ⲁⲕⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲃ̄ϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡ︤ⲣ̄︥ⲡⲙⲉⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲕ̄ ⲁⲕⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ϩⲙ ⲡⲟⲙⲉ
> ⲙ̄ⲡⲕ︤ⲧ︥ⲱⲗⲙ̄ (CT 14,21–15,7)[69]

> Rabbi, for you have come [with] knowledge to rebuke their ignorance. And you have come with remembrance to rebuke their forgetfulness. But I am not worried about you. You have come to ignorance, and you have not been defiled at all by it. You have come to forgetfulness, and remembrance was in you. You have walked in mud, but have not become dirty.

James continues by comparing himself with Jesus, but where Jesus succeeds, James fails: by becoming incarnate, his memory fades. The theme of forgetting one's origins when embodied is shared with ApJohn, in which the body acts as a chain of forgetfulness (NHC2 21,9–12), alongside the first humans being made to drink 'water of forgetfulness' (ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱϣⲉ [NHC2 25,7]) so that they would not know where their origins lay. ExegSoul and AuthTeach also urge the soul to *remember* where she originated.

The Soul's ascent in GMary frees her from 'the chain of forgetfulness' (ⲧⲙ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛⲧⲃ︤ⲱ︥ϣⲉ [17,3]) – presumably meaning the embodied state of forgetfulness that we see in 1ApocJas and ApJohn. The male disciples have forgotten their true origins, and that is why Mary can say '[what is] unknown to you and I remember, I will pr[oclaim to you]' ([οσα υμ]ας λανθανει (=ϩⲏⲡ) και απομνημονευω αγα[γγελω υμιν] [POxy.GM 18]). It is not simply that the male disciples are absentminded through their own ineptness; they are entangled in the material realm of forgetfulness.

---

[69] Scribal markings omitted for clarity. The NHC version is similar but more fragmentary.

5.4. The Soul's Victory

5.4.1. *Human-Slayer and Space-Destroyer*

As the Soul ascends, she meets the third power named Ignorance, who asks the usual question of where the Soul is going. The Soul does not answer, but asserts her dominance over the cosmos below:

[ⲁⲥ]ⲢⲉⲜⲈⲦⲀⳆⲈ ⲚⲦⲉⲨⲨⲬⲎ ⲈⲤⳆ[ⲱ Ⲙ]ⲘⲟⲤ ⳆⲈ ⲈⲢⲉⲂⲎⲔ ⲈⲦⲱⲚ ⳆⲚ [ⲟ]ⲨⲠⲟⲚⲎⲢⲒⲀ ⲀⲨⲀⲘⲀⳆⲦⲈ ⲘⲘⲟ ⲀⲨ[Ⲁ]ⲘⲀⳆⲦⲈ ⲆⲈ ⲘⲘⲟ ⲘⲠⲢⲔⲢⲒⲚⲈ ⲀⲨ[ⲱ] ⲠⲈⳆⲈ ⲦⲈⲨⲨⲬⲎ ⳆⲈ ⲀⳆⲢⲟ ⲈⲢⲉⲔⲢⲒⲚⲈ ⲘⲘⲟⲒ ⲈⲘⲠⲒⲔⲢⲒⲚⲈ ⲀⲨⲈⲘⲀⳆⲦⲈ ⲘⲘⲟⲒ ⲈⲘⲠⲒⲀⲘⲀⳆⲦⲈ ⲘⲠⲟⲨⲤⲟⲨⲱⲚⲦ ⲀⲚⲟⲔ ⲆⲈ ⲀⲒⲤⲟⲨⲱⲚⲟⲨ ⲈⲨⲂⲱⲖ ⲈⲂⲟⲖ ⲘⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ ⲈⲒⲦⲈ ⲚⲀ ⲠⲔⲀⳆ ⲈⲒⲦⲈ ⲚⲀ ⲦⲠ[ⲉ] ⲚⲦⲈⲢⲈⲦⲈⲨⲨⲬⲎ ⲟⲨⲱⲤϤ ⲚⲦⲘⲉⳆϢⲟⲘⲚⲦⲈ ⲚⲚⲉⳆⲟⲨⲤⲒⲀ ⲀⲤⲂⲱⲔ ⲈⲠⲤⲀ ⲚⲦⲠⲈ ⲀⲨⲱ ⲀⲤⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲦⲘⲀⳆϤⲦⲟⲈ ⲚⲚⲉⳆⲟⲨⲤⲒⲀ (15,12–16,4)

[She] questioned the Soul, sa[yi]ng, 'Where are you going? In [w]ickedness, they bound you. You are indeed b[o]und. Do not judge'. An[d] the Soul said, 'Why do you judge me? I did not judge. They bound me; I did not bind. They did not recognize me; but I recognized them. All things are dissolving, both the things of the earth and the things of the heav[en]'. When the Soul had destroyed the third of the powers she went upwards and saw the fourth of the powers.

As in the exchange with Desire, the Soul exploits the claims made by Ignorance, claiming that she did not judge or bind and that it was the cosmic powers (and their corresponding passions) that bound her. She recognized their true identity but they did not recognize hers.[70] What exactly the Soul means by judgement is difficult to understand. King and Tuckett regard this passage as reflecting the Saviour's teachings on sin: without sin, there is no judgement or condemnation.[71] It may be an implicit attack on enforcing rules outside of the Saviour's teachings, like the reference to the 'Lawgiver' (νομοθέτης) in the Saviour's farewell discourse; or it may simply mean that the Soul did not participate in immoral behaviour. The Soul's words regarding all things dissolving demonstrates her profound understanding of the unstable nature of the material cosmos. The present tense of ⲈⲨⲂⲱⲖ ⲈⲂⲟⲖ

---

[70] There is a translation difficulty here as the third-person prefixes ⲀⲨ- and ⲘⲠⲟⲨ- may be translated in the active or the passive sense. Either way, the Soul was bound and not recognized.
[71] King, *Mary*, 71; Tuckett, *Mary*, 183.

(is dissolving) reflects the inauguration of the dissolution because of the Good, discussed in the previous chapter.

Conquering Ignorance allows the Soul to proceed to the fourth power, embodying 'the seven p[o]wers of Wrath' (ⲧⲥⲁϣϥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ[ⲍ̄]ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ [16,12–13]). These powers also question the Soul, asking, 'Where do you come from Human-Slayer? Or, where do you go Space-Destroyer?' (ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲓⲛ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲧϩⲁⲧⲃ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲟⲩϩⲁⲥϥⲙⲁ [16,14–15]). At this point, the Soul does not see this as a challenge; rather, she declares that she is already free:

> ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ̈ ⲁⲩⲕⲟⲛⲥ̄ϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ̈
> ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲟⲥϥ<ϥ> ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲁⲥϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲙ̄ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩ̄ ⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩ `ϩⲛ̄´ ⲟⲩ[ⲕⲟⲥ]ⲙⲟⲥ
> ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲃⲟⲗⲧ´ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩ]ⲱ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ
> ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲙ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲃ̄ϣⲉ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲓ̈ϣ ϫⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ
> ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲙⲡ`ⲁⲓ´ⲱⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ (16,16–17,7)

The Soul answered and said, 'That which bound me has been slain and that which surrounds me has been destroyed. And my Desire deceased and Ignorance died. In a [wor]ld I was dissolved from a world, [an]d in a type from a type which is above, and the chain of the forgetfulness which exists only for a while. From this time on, I will receive Rest from the time of the season of the age, in silence'.

The Soul explains where she has been: bound in the material world, dominated by passions, and living in a state of forgetfulness. And where she is going: to receive Rest. At the same time, she replies to the charges of 'Human-Slayer', as eliminating the body corrupted by passion, and 'Space-Destroyer', as overcoming the cosmic archons and recognizing the state of the dissolving, impermanent cosmos. The syntax of the final sentence is not clear here: Wilson and MacRae translate 'rest of the time',[72] but Pasquier suggests rest *from* the time.[73] Pasquier's suggestion works well here as temporality can be used as a means of oppression, as in ApJohn, in which humans are 'bound by means of measure and times and moments' (ⲥⲱⲛϩ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϣⲓ ⲙⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲏⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ [ᴮᴳ 72,4–6]), related to fate. By translating 'Rest from the time', the immutable heaven is understood as existing beyond temporal and spatial limits.

---

[72] R. McL. Wilson and George W. MacRae, 'The Gospel According to Mary: BG, 1:7,1–19,5', in *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berlinensis 8502,1 and 4.*, ed. D. M. Parrott, NHS 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 567.

[73] Pasquier, *Marie*, 95–96.

Human recognition of the dissolving cosmos, and overcoming it, is also found in GThom. As we saw in the last chapter, logion 3 and 113 pronounce a realized eschatology in that the kingdom is already present (like GMary's Son of Man); and logion 11 and 111 reflect the idea that the heaven and earth will pass away. Logion 111 is particularly comparable to GMary:

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲁϭⲱⲗ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ϥⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲙⲟⲩ (GThom 111.1)

Jesus said, 'The heavens and the earth will roll up in your presence and the one who lives from the Living One will not see death'.

Davies reads GThom 3 and 113 in light of 11 and 111, and argues that 'when a man of light discovers the kingdom within, he is superior to the world previously and ordinarily apprehended, a world which for him has now passed away'.[74] Gathercole, likewise, contends that the cosmic collapse of 11 and 111 is a 'relatively quiet matter' and is insignificant to the Thomasine disciple who, having undergone a challenge from hostile archons (GThom 50), will live forever.[75] It is the living one who understands this message who 'will not taste death' (ϥⲛⲁϫⲓ ϯⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲙⲟⲩ` [GThom 1]). Like the Thomasine disciple, the Soul of GMary understands that she is separate from, and superior to, the dissolving cosmos. As she ascends, she eliminates fleshly desires and understands the nature of the material heavens and earth.

5.4.2. *Rest and Restoration*

The terms 'Rest' and 'silence' describe the ultimate destiny for the Soul after her ascent. The two terms are connected, as seen in the description of the divine realm in ApJohn, quoted earlier: 'at rest in silence' (ⲉϥⲙ̅ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ [BG 26,7–8]). Silence is simply a state of Rest.[76]

The motif of Rest as the post-mortem goal of the human is fairly common in early Christian literature, including Matt 11.29 (you will find rest for your souls [εὑρήσετε

---

[74] Davies, 'The Christology and Protology of the "Gospel of Thomas,"' 672.
[75] Gathercole, 'The Eschatology of the Gospel of Thomas,' 294–95.
[76] King: 'It is in silence that one ultimately encounters God', Karen L. King, 'Hearing, Seeing, and Knowing God: Allogenes and the Gospel of Mary', in *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*, ed. David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, and David W. Pao (Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2003), 325.

ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν]) and Heb 4.1–11, in which the righteous are invited to enter into God's 'Rest' (κατάπαυσις).[77] It is found in a number of dialogue gospels, including EpAp (12.3; 19.14; 26.5), EpPetPhil (ₙₕ꜀ 137,10), DialSav (120,5–8) and BookThom (145,8–16). 'Rest' in GMary is the final resting place of the Soul; it is the post-mortem fate of the individual, but can be partly realized in the present. Mary falls silent as the Soul does – she has attained the state of Rest, as will be discussed in the next section.

In GMary, the Rest is protological. As the Soul returns to the place from which she came, ἀνάπαυσις is related to the idea of ἀποκατάστασις, understood as the return of all creation, or at least rational beings, to the Good, or God.[78] For Philo ἀποκατάστασις is in reference to the restoration of the *soul* (τελείαν ἀποκατάστασιν ψυχῆς [*Her.* 293]), from sins and passions (πάθη).[79] Clement, influenced by Philo, also depicts the perfection of the 'gnostic' soul, which dwells in the divine, as an apokatastasis or restitution to the highest place of rest (εἰς τὸν κορυφαῖον ἀποκαταστήσῃ τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τόπον [*Strom.* 7.10.57.1–4]). There, it will see God 'face to face'. But, for Clement the restoration of the soul is not entirely protological: thanks to Christ's coming, the end is better than the beginning.[80]

5.4.3. *Realized or Post-Mortem Salvation?*

The disciple, for GMary, does not need to be deceased to attain Rest – or partial Rest, at least. It is clear that the living and embodied Mary has defeated the powers named Ignorance, Wrath and Desire. She receives private revelation from the Lord; she is 'blessed' (ⲛⲁⲓ̈ⲁⲧⲉ) as she does not waver at the vision of the Saviour (10,14–15); she comforts the male disciples, turning their minds towards the Good (9,12–22); and the Saviour not only 'loved her more than the other women' (ⲟⲩⲁϣⲉ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲕⲉⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ ⲛⲥϩ̄ⲓ̈ⲙⲉ [10,1–3]) but, as Levi tells Peter and Andrew, the Saviour 'loved her more than us' (ⲟⲩⲟϣⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ [18,14–15]). The beloved disciple and comforter who teaches the others about salvation is clearly not under the

---

[77] On the multiple parallels, see C. Schneider, 'Anapausis', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* I (1950): 414–18. For the eschatological interpretation of Matt 11.28–30, see W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Matthew 8–18*, vol. 2, ICC (London and New York: T&T Clark, 1991), 288–89. On the various interpretations of 'rest' in Hebrews, see Harold W. Attridge, '"Let Us Strive to Enter That Rest": The Logic of Hebrews 4:1–11', *HTR* 73, no. 1–2 (1980): 279.

[78] See Ilaria Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*, VCSupp 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1. Origen is usually credited with being the founder of this doctrine in Christianity but Ramelli shows that he had several antecedents.

[79] See Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, 6–7. For Philo, apokatastasis can also refer to the restoration of the soul to health after the abandonment of evil.

[80] Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, 119–36, esp. 135–36.

influence of the powers – in contrast to the 'wrathful'(ⲛⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ) Peter, who is likened to the adversaries (18,7–10). As the Soul reaches silence at the end of her journey, Mary falls silent at the end of her recollection. The Coptic MS inserts a scribal break here, showing that Mary's silence should be read alongside the Soul's and Jesus', rather than as part of the subsequent argument between the disciples.[81]

It is often noted that, in Jewish and Christian literature, the ascent of the soul can be post-mortem ('eschatological') or while embodied ('ecstatic').[82] In terms of eschatological salvation, these journeys can be characterized in terms of future or realized eschatology. But these do not have to be mutually exclusive – salvation can be a process. Salvation in GMary may have been realized in two stages: the knowledge gained in the body and the journey of the Soul after death. Pagels and Koester see this idea in DialSav, noting a realized/future 'paradox' throughout the text. The opening projects a realized eschatology:

ⲏⲇⲏ ⲁⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲛⲁⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛϩⲓⲥⲉ · ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲁϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ · ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϣϩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ̄ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ϥⲛⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ (120,3–6)
Already the time has come, brothers, for us to abandon our labour and stand in Rest. For whoever stands in Rest will rest forever.

This is shortly followed by an implication of future eschatology, 'when the time of dissolution comes' (ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [122,2–3]), and Jesus instructs his disciples that the power of fear will come upon them. The little that remains of the account of cosmic powers battling the Soul in the very fragmentary text appears to be similar to GMary. DialSav, however, contains an explicit reference to baptism (134,5–8) and a vision of the Eternal existent (134,24–138,1) that Pagels and Koester understand to inform the whole tractate: '[W]e find *Dial. Sav.* dealing with the tension between what the disciples have received "already" through baptism, initiation and visions, and what they anticipate as "not yet"'.[83] DeConick, on the other hand, regards DialSav as *anticipating* death, ascent and

---

[81] Hartenstein understands Mary's silence as indicating that 'Maria wird also als eine dargestellt, die ein hohes Maß an Vollkommenheit erreicht hat', Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, 149.
[82] See e.g. Jan N. Bremmer, 'Descents to Hell and Ascents to Heaven in Apocalyptic Literature', in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 350–52.
[83] Emmel, Koester, and Pagels, *Nag Hammadi Codex III,5*, 14. They find parallels in EpPetPhil, Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter and GPhil.

immortalization; baptism does not guarantee such ascent (or foretaste of salvation), but knowledge of one's origins is what is necessary.[84] In GMary, it appears that Mary, while knowing the Soul's origins, has achieved a (semi-)state of eschatological salvation, and has fulfilled the teachings of the gospel: she has found the Son of Man within and put on the Perfect Man.

Evidently there is an aspect of a realized salvation or eschatology in GMary, akin to the Johannine 'eternal life' and the Ephesian idea of already being seated in heaven (Eph 2.6). For John, the crucial event is the coming of Jesus, and one abides in a figurative death until one believes. John's eternal life can begin in the present body; the evangelist has Jesus tell his readers that believers have already passed from death to life (5.24–25). The language of resurrection figures in the present ('For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will' [ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῳοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζῳοποιεῖ, 5.21]), yet they will not be raised until the 'last day' (ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ [6.40]). At Lazarus' tomb, Martha echoes this sentiment ('I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day' [οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 11.24]), but Jesus corrects her assumption, declaring himself the resurrection and the life (11.25).[85] As Lazarus is raised, it is evident that the 'last day' has already come. Neither GMary nor John emphasize the coming of Christ as a future eschatological event.[86] Rather, the individual eschatology focuses on the 'realized' element: the Saviour's coming has the ability to bring eternal life, or Rest, in the present time

The Pauline influence is evident here too, as (pseudo-)Paul exhorts his readers to fight the cosmic powers (Eph 6.12), while also declaring that, although they were once 'children of wrath' (τέκνα ὀργῆς) living in the 'passions of the flesh' (ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκός, 2.3), they can now participate in heaven whilst living on earth. As Talbert writes, believers 'live in two dimensions'.[87] The language as well as the concepts of battling the cosmic ἐξουσίαι

---

[84] April D. DeConick, 'The "Dialogue of the Savior" and the Mystical Sayings of Jesus', *VC* 50, no. 2 (1996): esp. 183.

[85] This is not to deny the Johannine tension between future and realized eschatology: John 5.28–29 clearly suggests that there will be an eschatological resurrection in the future. As Ashton writes, John 'has not altogether abandoned the belief that there will be a *future* judgement as well… [yet for] the most part John effectively *de-eschatologizes* judgement by making it the immediate consequence of an option for or against Christ in the lifetime of each individual', Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 406, 409. Dodd argues that the evangelist is deliberately juxtaposing two contrasting eschatologies, C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 320–28.

[86] The exception to this in John is 14.3: 'And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, so that where I am, there you may be also' (καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε).

[87] Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 60.

(ⲉϩⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ), linked with ἐπιθυμία (ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ), σάρξ (ⲥⲁⲣ̅ⲝ) and ὀργή (ⲟⲣⲅⲏ), mirror those we have seen in GMary. Mary, having defeated the Powers, lives in both the earth and the heavens and has achieved Rest, which in effect is eternal life.

Yet in spite of Mary's embodied state of Rest, for salvation in the fullest sense the Soul requires freedom from the body. The dialogue with Wrath points to a post-mortem, post-body ascent in which the Soul becomes the Human-slayer (16,15). The Soul was once bound in the body-garment, influenced by passions, but she does not belong there. Her destiny is a passion-free existence in her heavenly home. Salvation, then, must, occur in two phases: belief/knowledge (leading to a possibly initiatory ascent) and post-mortem ascent. GMary conceives the event of eschatological salvation as beginning with belief/knowledge, to be furthered at the moment of death, and as culminating in following Jesus into post-mortem Rest.

Conclusion

In our discussion of the narrative frame of GMary, we saw a parallelism between Jesus and Mary. This parallelism continues in this chapter, in which Mary represents the Christian Soul following Christ into heaven. The individual salvation in the gospel is predicated entirely on Christ's own ascension, and Mary tells her brothers about his ascension, as she is instructed to do in John 20.17. By doing so, she also teaches them how to gain their own eschatological Rest. Like Christ, the Soul in GMary descends from her heavenly home through a cosmos full of archons and powers, and enters a body. Once embodied, she must fight disturbance, passion and forgetfulness, overcoming bodily desires and remembering her heavenly origin. Then she can ascend through the heavens, each with its guardian that will attempt to stop her, but she must tell them that she is free from their influence. And she can do so under the instruction of Jesus, just as Jesus has done during his own descent and ascent. It is then that she is free from the dissolving cosmos and gains Rest.

Although Peter and Andrew profess that they have never heard revelation of this kind, we see it throughout the early Christian world and its wider context. AscIsa and EpAp narrate Jesus descending through the archons in disguise; Plato tells us that restful souls have descended into a body in which they have been thrown into movement through the passions. In GThom 50 and 1ApocJas, Jesus instructs the disciples to remember their divine origins and to declare this to the cosmic archons during their heavenly ascent. The disciple will then

find Rest, which is a common motif for post-mortem salvation in Matthew, Hebrews, BookThom, EpAp, and elsewhere.

The individual eschatology of GMary finds parallels not only with the gospel's narrative frame, in which Mary and Jesus are constructed in tandem, but also with the cosmic eschatology as both Matter and the Soul return to their origins through Christ. The Saviour in GMary has come to dissolve the cosmos, freeing Matter from sin and passion. It will be dissolved to its root. He also lives within the disciples, like the Johannine Jesus and the Pauline Christ, and by seeking, finding and following him, the disciple can also be free from passion. The Soul can follow Jesus through the planetary spheres of Pauline cosmology to find Rest, akin to the Johannine eternal life. As in John, the disciple can reach this state of eschatological salvation in the present Christian experience, although full eschatological salvation will be met after death. The disciple's salvation is neither dependent on nor concerned with the dissolving heavens and earth – the Soul recognizes this but overcomes it. Both the individual and cosmic eschatology is conditional upon Jesus, but neither is conditional upon the other.

Conclusion

In the first couple of centuries after Jesus' death, his followers were writing gospels in which he speaks with those who were his disciples in Galilee, revealing new teachings or explaining those which needed clarification. In these dialogue gospels, Jesus speaks to Mary, or Peter, or James, or Thomas, or the Twelve, or some of the Twelve, and tells them about their salvation. In most cases, he then leaves the disciples on their own, to follow his commands, preach the gospel to the nations, or keep the gospel hidden for a time.

The dialogue gospels are a sub-set of gospel literature. The wider 'gospel' genre comprises a range of texts in which we find a wealth of interpretations of the character Jesus and his revelation. Each gospel, whether canonical or non-canonical, offers a new narrative of ancient Christianity and a new interpretation of its foundational figure. It is on this basis that canonical gospels and dialogue gospels find a common ground and can be brought into conversation. These two overlapping collections of gospel literature (which cross at the point of the Johannine farewell discourse) are intrinsically interrelated: their content reflects the same world of thought, centred around the salvific figure of Christ. The fact that the dialogue gospels are (probably) later than the canonical gospels and (probably) used these earlier gospels does not make them less valuable or interesting. After all, John was (probably) later than Mark. John (probably) used Mark. But John is not fundamentally different to Mark, nor less respectable.

Mark and John converge at the point of form, potentially separating the dialogues from these biographies.[1] But, canonical gospels are not just biographies, and the dialogue gospels are not just dialogues (EpAp and EpPetPhil, for example, are also letters). John may be primarily a biography but it contains a farewell discourse, in which dialogue is found. John 13.31–17.1 shares the structure of many dialogue gospels, of Jesus in conversation with selected disciples imparting his final revelations. There are many points of convergence between canonical gospels and dialogue gospels, and reading them together as belonging within the field of early Christian gospels produces fruitful results for our understanding of the textual world of early Christianity.

That is not to say that gospel literature itself should be segregated from its wider literary context. Throughout this thesis, I have attempted to read dialogue gospels alongside

---

[1] Accepting the Burridge point of view, Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, SNTSMS 70 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

canonical gospels *and* Pauline letters *and* early Christian thinkers, showing that they are all part of the same world. They do not think the same way on every matter, and even issues that shape our whole understanding of theology will see great divergence (creation and resurrection, for example). Yet despite these divergences, they converge at the single fundamental, theological issue: the saving role of Christ. And from this beginning point, connections are many and various, and they show that dialogue gospels do not stand on the margins of the Christian world but firmly within it.[2]

Looking back …

In this thesis, I started with a broad discussion about dialogue gospels as a whole, asking how and why do we define a genre, and then compared them to NT texts. This included snippets of dialogue gospels and broad, sweeping overviews. In order to develop points about shared and contrasting features within the dialogue gospel genre, its key themes and intertextual relationship with NT texts, I homed in on one example – the *Gospel of Mary*. Part One informed Part Two. It provided a basis for GMary's literary context. However, in the conclusion, I will work backwards to see how Part Two can develop Part One.

Part Two's focus on GMary ended with two chapters on the gospel's eschatology and began with a discussion of the narrative frame. The final chapter, the analysis of the ascent of the Soul, highlighted GMary's connections to John 20.17 and 1ApocJas – it is in the first instance Jesus' own ascension, which he instructed Mary to disclose to his brothers in John 20.17, that is narrated in GMary. However, in the second instance it is a didactic story for the disciple's salvation: through Jesus' ascension he has paved a way for the ascent of the disciple's soul, as in 1ApocJas, and here is instruction on how to follow him. The Soul must declare to heavenly powers that it is from 'above' and is returning home. This narrative is connected with GThom 50, in which Jesus speaks of an uncontextualized dialogue in which the disciple must declare that they are from the light and the living Father. Further connections to the dialogue in GMary can be found in Plato and 'Orphism', and placing these

---

[2] An issue that has not been dealt with is the (later) *scriptural* status of John FD and the contested status of ApocPet, which was provisionally included within the Muratorian Canon (ll. 71–72), cited as scripture by Clement, belonged to 'the inspired writings' of Methodius, and was 'disputed' alongside Jude and the catholic epistles by Eusebius. On the reception of ApocPet by these authors and more, see A. Jakab, 'The Reception of the Apocalypse of Peter in Ancient Christianity', in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz, Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 7 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 174–86. I have tried to disassociate these texts from scriptural/semi-scriptural/heresy biases as much as possible and to read them in their own right, but mentioning that some of them were embraced by 'orthodox' thinkers in the ancient world demonstrates that the genre as a whole was not marginalized.

various traditions side by side highlighted how the individual eschatology of GMary has a christological basis. The basic message of the gospel is not dissimilar to what we find in John: Jesus is Saviour – he has ascended – his disciples can follow. This can be post-mortem, when the Soul frees itself from the bodily passions, or realized, as exemplified by the model disciple Mary.

GMary's cosmic eschatology was the subject of chapter four. Like the individual eschatology, this was interpreted christologically and placed within a wider Christian context. It was argued that GMary shares the common Christian belief that Matter is the raw material of the cosmos, shaped by God. Matter has been affected by passions, which in turn affect the individual causing sin and death. And this is why Jesus (called 'the Good') has come: to dissolve-restore the cosmos to its original constituent parts (called its 'root'). The concept of dissolution is a point at which GMary converges with other early Christian literature; yet it diverges from the 'traditional' expectation of a future Parousia (cf. Matt 24.30–31) and actively contradicts this by stating that the Son of Man is 'within'. Tuckett and King, among others, read the Son of Man to be distinct from Christ, but my interpretation follows de Boer and Schröter who argue that the Son of Man is Jesus, who can live within the disciples and be 'put on' (cf. John 17.26, Rom 13.14). In GMary, the Son of Man has descended from heaven (cf. John 3.13), which is understood both as the Good coming to inaugurate the dissolution and Christ being within. GMary does not reduce the eschatological idea that we find particularly in Matthew, but reinterprets it by using ideas already present in John and Paul.

The gospel's cosmic eschatology is partly connected to its individual eschatology and partly separate from it. Jesus will dissolve the material cosmos to its original constituent parts and Jesus will enable the Soul to ascend to its heavenly home. Yet, despite this parallel movement, the two eschatological systems appear to have little overlap – as the Soul makes her journey to heaven, she recognizes that heaven and earth are dissolving but is undisturbed by the process. The two teachings form a 'bipartite' eschatology, which is reflected also in the structure of GMary: the two teachings are quite literally in two parts. The first teaching is the conversation between the Saviour and his disciple(s), in which he teaches them about cosmic eschatology; the second is Mary's recollection of her vision of the ascending Soul, in which she teaches her brothers about individual eschatology.

I have attempted to extricate GMary from the construct of 'gnosticism' that it is often encumbered with, and relocate it in a broader category of general Christian traditions. The preference to read it alongside ApJohn must stem from their adjacent positions in the Berlin

Codex rather than the texts themselves. ApJohn contains an evil and ignorant demiurge Yaldabaoth who creates the world, and he and his cronies entrap Adam in the body out of spite. GMary does not have this. There are certain similarities between the two texts, such as the body being a place where humanity forget their heavenly origins or 'divine spark', but that does not have to be the work of an evil demiurge. If GMary envisaged a demiurge that loiters over the cosmos, the Soul might be expected to meet it on her way through the heavens (cf. ApocPaul). Rather than viewing the material world as the invention and playground of the demiurge or devil (cf. ExegSoul, AuthTeach), GMary merely states that the material cosmos has been overcome with passions that sway the Soul from its original state of heavenly Rest (cf. Clement, Philo). Passions are the Soul's vices, not Matter itself. The condition of humanity in the world stands as close to Paul as it does to ApJohn.

In the thesis, we have seen how the eschatological revelations of Jesus and Mary play their part within the narrative frame, but to frame the question backwards, how does the narrative frame work to serve the eschatological teachings? Although the answer is similar, it takes a slightly different nuance and coheres with our holistic understanding of the gospel. The bipartite eschatological system is divided into two teachings: two separate dialogues with two separate revealers. But for the teachings contained in GMary to work, the narrative frame is essential. For Mary to recall Jesus' soul's journey, he must have *departed* and *ascended.* He must also have *appeared* to her to *reveal* the story of his ascension. But Mary could not have also revealed the cosmic eschatology – it must be clear to the readers/hearers that it is Jesus who is ultimately the revealer and saviour. If Mary alone revealed eschatological truth, there might be no actual truth in it. Jesus' presence as risen Lord at the beginning of the text authenticates the whole gospel. Furthermore, the disciples must debate the eschatological teachings.[3] They debate (ⲅⲩⲙⲛⲁⲍⲉ) the Saviour's words following his eschatological teaching; they contest Mary's eschatological teaching, declaring it heretical (ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ). The debate in the narrative frame serves to authenticate the revelation: As Levi says, Jesus loved and trusted Mary and therefore Peter and Andrew (and thus the readers) should likewise. The narrative frame substantiates the eschatological revelation. Contrary to a widespread view of dialogue gospels, there is absolutely no evidence that GMary is a Christian narrative frame imposed on a 'gnostic' (non-Christian) dialogue. Quite the opposite.

---

[3] The reason why is unclear, presumably some sort of wider debate lies in the background. Peter and Mary's debate in GThom 114, and PistSoph (2.72 (162,16–18)), and Andrew's inability to accept the ascent of the Soul (although it is Jesus telling him about it!) in PistSoph, show that GMary is not in isolation in presenting these issues.

Having focused on GMary, drawing comparisons to other literature where appropriate, we can now reflect on its wider literary context – which takes us back to Part One. Here the focus was on dialogue gospels as a genre, asking what could be included and by what criteria we exclude texts from a genre. For the purpose of comparison, genre should be inclusive and open. Texts can participate in more than one genre – John FD, for example, belongs within a *bios* gospel, but that does not preclude its inclusion in the dialogue gospel genre. EpPetPhil and EpAp are letters, gospels *and* dialogues. Any construction of a genre is heuristic and temporary. It is formed to serve a purpose, and can be unformed.

With this in mind, genre allows various, even disparate, texts to be brought together for comparison, and juxtaposition allows their similarities and unique qualities to be brought to the surface. At the end of the first chapter, I provided a preliminary comparative survey of three main themes found within dialogue gospels: revelation, the revealer and eschatology. Dialogue gospels are comparable in that each is attentive to eschatological revelation, yet the revelations themselves are divergent. Looking at how dialogue gospels portray the post-mortem fate of the individual, there are six things that might be included: (1) judgement, (2) resurrection of the flesh, (3) ascent of the disembodied soul, (4) torments/hell, (5) reincarnation, and (6) Rest/heaven. Any number of these can be combined in a single dialogue gospel: ApJohn proposes that a human can be judged, be reincarnated, find Rest or be damned. Judgement can happen to the soul (BookThom) or to resurrected flesh (ApocPet). The overlaps and connections in these revelations demonstrates how problematic it is to taxonomize these texts into particular theological groups.

Constructing a dialogue gospel genre allows for this sort of comparative work, which draws out connections between texts in thematic clusters and highlights unique qualities of individual texts. Reading GMary alongside EpAp, the ascent of Jesus' ethereal Soul stands in contrast with the confirmation of the unyielding corporeality of Jesus' risen body. Yet such differences are not at the expense of the texts' similarities – both texts emphasize an ascent-descent christology through levels of heavens in which divine beings dwell. GMary focuses on Jesus' post-mortem ascension (15,1–17,7); EpAp on Jesus' incarnational descent (13.1–14.5). As GMary concentrates on leaving the flesh, EpAp concentrates on entering it. But neither is at the expense of the other: GMary *also* implies an incarnational descent through the Soul's dialogue with the powers (15,2–3), and EpAp *also* includes a cinematic narration of Jesus' (albeit fleshly) ascension as a bright cloud takes him away (51.2–3). In both texts, Jesus descends in disguise from the heavenly beings – whether it is for their protection or his

is where these gospels differ. In spite of these differences, the points of convergence suggest that EpAp and GMary sit very closely together in the extensive body of early Christian literature.

By comparing and contrasting a risen Jesus who may or may not be in 'another form' (as in Mark 16.12), the corporeality of Jesus in EpAp alone is highlighted. Had we compared EpAp only to John 20.24–29 or Luke 24.36–43, in which all the texts invite the disciples to touch Jesus, we may have noted their similarities, without noticing how EpAp takes Jesus' corporeality further than Luke and John. In EpAp, there is *one* appearance of the risen Jesus. He appears to the women outside the tomb and they travel together to the male disciples. The author of EpAp leaves absolutely no room to allow for another appearance of Jesus – he does not and could not appear through locked doors (cf. John 20.19) or vanish (cf. Luke 24.31). EpAp does not sit as closely to Luke and John as one might expect due to the traditional (proto-)'orthodox' label. Rather, EpAp is taking the Lukan and Johannine issue of physicality and pushing it in one direction – the direction that happened to become 'orthodox' but diverges from the canonical gospels.

Further thematic connections between dialogue gospels and texts that came to be included in the NT were drawn out in chapter two. In general, dialogue gospels stem from traditions found within the canonical gospels and thought-world of Paul. Certain themes were selected from each of the canonical gospels, Acts and selected Pauline epistles and it was seen how they were developed in the dialogue gospels, either in line with their predecessors or diverging from them. In many cases, dialogue gospels and canonical texts are really rather close, with comparable interests including the risen Jesus, the worldwide apostolic mission and the disclosure (or non-disclosure) of mysteries.

Going forward … Further Research on Dialogue Gospels

Dialogue gospels are rarely read as holistic texts. Too often our reading of them is shaped by the presupposition that they are a composite of sources cobbled together. SophJesChr is seen as a narrative frame superimposed onto a 'gnostic' dialogue (Eugnostos, which precedes in the NHC3) and DialSav is seen as sayings of Jesus moulded into a whole. GThom, likewise, is a collection of sayings which are often not read in light of each other. But someone has put these texts together and made sense of them as a whole. And once we appreciate that they are a work of craftsmanship rather than some incompetent scribe haphazardly assembling various texts and traditions, they can then be subjected to the same hermeneutical methodologies that

are used for NT texts. All texts are inspired by previous texts: Luke used Mark and Matthew,[4] but the gospel is not primarily read as an amalgamation of other older texts.

This view of dialogue gospels leads to the general assumption that the authors used non-Christian sources, and thus the text has been 'Christianized'. As I have shown in Part Two, GMary is a unified text, and is thoroughly Christian. Every part of its teachings is predicated on the saving role of Christ. Dialogue gospels are often read as 'not really Christian' or 'superficially Christian', which skews their interpretation and use. I would propose, going forward, that we apply christological readings to bits we are not too sure about (e.g. the Son of Man in GMary or the Saviour in SophJesChr) and see what happens. And only then will we see dialogue gospels (and other non-canonical gospels) for what they are: Christian.

The relationships between gospel literature often centre around the question of dependency. This is the case both for canonical gospels (e.g. did Luke use Matthew?), and for whether non-canonical gospels are dependent on the canonical (e.g. did EpAp know the Synoptics and John?). The interdependency of dialogue gospels has not been a feature of this thesis and is rarely explored elsewhere (we have briefly touched upon Hartenstein's argument that ApJas knew and used 1ApocJas, but this takes up three pages of her monograph). Dependency within the genre itself might be an interesting new avenue of research. It is my inclination that PistSoph knew and used GMary and GThom (logion 114 at least). In PistSoph, Andrew cannot accept the teaching on the ascent of the Soul (cf. GMary), and Mary declares that Peter hates women (cf. GThom 114). It also knew a version of the Sophia myth, but this diverges from ApJohn in that Sophia does not originate from nor is restored to the divine realm. In PistSoph, she resides in the lower heavens. Perhaps its cosmology is a more Valentinian take on the 'Sethian' ApJohn? This I cannot answer here.

Going forward … Dialogue Gospels, the New Testament and Early Christian Studies
In spite of the surge in research on extra-canonical literature, the boundaries once drawn between the New Testament and 'apocryphal' texts remain sharp. Only in 2015 did the concluding chapter of the *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha* open:

> The majority of contemporary scholars of the Christian Apocrypha work on texts that
> have little impact on discussions of the origins or interpretation of the New

---

[4] Or Q, depending on your viewpoint.

Testament. And most New Testament scholars take little notice of non-canonical texts, particularly if they consider the literature to postdate the canonical texts, more so if theological interests lead to dismissing the Christian Apocrypha as worthless, deceptive, ridiculous, or heretical.[5]

'Little notice' is a shrewd choice of words here. (Everything I am about to say is a generalization and there are *many* exceptions; but generalizations are often helpful.[6]) This lack of interest can be easily illustrated by a glance at the index of ancient texts in any number of scholarly works relating to 'the Gospels', which will typically feature a wide range of Jewish material, from the Hebrew Bible to Qumran to Josephus and beyond, Graeco-Roman literature in various genres, perhaps some patristic sources, but next to nothing apart from GThom under the questionable heading of 'NT Apocrypha'.[7] Admittedly, many scholars who focus on the New Testament do show some willingness to engage with non-canonical literature, at least superficially. Yet their interest tends to extend no further than one of the better-known 'non-canonical gospels', GThom, GMary or even GJudas (there would be little chance of finding engagement with DialSav, BookThom or even EpAp). But such notice as it is taken of these texts often has an underlying sense of patronizing dismissal or mockery.[8] There is inherent suspicion directed to non-canonical texts, in which many modern readers expect to find uncongenial and unsettling portrayals of Jesus. Of course these apocryphal gospels do not tell us anything about the historical Jesus, they write, attempting to qualify their own use of such texts. Well no, of course they do not tell us about the historical

---

[5] Tony Burke, 'Early Christian Apocrypha in Contemporary Theological Discourse', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 441–42.

[6] I am open to criticism here on my generalizations being reflective of certain schools and contexts. PhD theses coming out of Harvard, Princeton, UNC and UT Austin, to name a few, show real engagement with the NT and apocryphal literature. Scholarship in the Nordic countries demonstrates great interest in Coptic Nag Hammadi texts, but the 'new philology' has pushed this away from a NT context and into a fourth/fifth-century monastic context. Thus, GMary would be read alongside Origen rather than the Gospel of John. This is useful but answers a different set of questions to my own. I am less aware of the Canadian context, but Burke's quotation above suggests that it may be similar to the British.

[7] See for example Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner, ed., *The Written Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 337–54, esp. 350–51.

[8] GThom is a favourite target. According to Wright, 'it is the gnosticism of the *Gospel of Thomas*, so beloved of the Jesus Seminar, that is the really world-denying and dualist philosophy, not the Jewish apocalyptic of Jesus and Mark', N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), 72 n.207. Meier finds in GThom 'a strange mixture of mysticism, asceticism, pantheism, and polytheism', John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 126. As for GMary, it is 'wholly dominated by Gnostic cosmology and anthropology', M. Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. Trans. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 2000), 249.

Jesus – but does that bar them from scholarly discussion? Studies of the historical Jesus would have no use for such texts, but not all scholarship focuses on that topic. What these 'apocryphal' texts do provide is a picture of the early reception of Jesus traditions, whether or not they agree with any of the diverse theological stances taken by the NT texts and church fathers.

The New Testament and its study is often seen as a self-contained enterprise, set apart from study of the rest of the early Christian world. The study of early Christianities is one thing; the study of the NT is something else.[9] The former might include a mass of early Christian literature outside of the NT (apocryphal acts, martyrologies, apostolic fathers, the Nag Hammadi texts, etc.), social studies (identity formation, the empire, monasticism, ritual, slaves, gender, scribes, etc.), structures of authority (bishops, canon formation, women, etc.) and theological issues (interpretation of scripture, doctrine of god, creation, ethics, etc.), with overlap between them. Yet, such issues are often marginal to the realm of NT studies. When NT scholarship seeks to engage with the wider context, it typically focuses only on the predecessors and contemporaries of its primary texts. But the closest literary neighbours to NT texts are those Christian writings that postdate it, given the shared genres, characters and themes: gospels, epistles, acts and apocalypses, mostly attributed pseudonymously to apostolic authors or other prestigious figures. As the non-canonical works tend to be later, they thus represent 'reception' instead of 'influence', but are no less useful than pre-Christian literature in informing interpretation of NT texts as they belong within the same literary context. *Perhaps* the earliest readers of the canonical gospels would have had a better idea of what Jesus was talking about than we do, considering our incomparable contexts.

A similar point can be made for *Patristic literature*.[10] There is a renewed interest in patristic exegesis of the NT, yet Patristics and NT studies still sit on other sides of the

---

[9] A microcosm of this can be seen through the scholar's view on the distinction between canonical and non-canonical gospels. Thus Bockmuehl argues that canonical gospels are 'unique and distinctive' (226) whereas noncanonical gospels are 'epiphenomenal and supplementary' (29, italics removed), Markus Bockmuehl, *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*, Interpretation (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017).

[10] 'Patristics' apparently became 'early Christian studies' in the late twentieth century: 'The term "patristics" fell increasingly into disuse, taken as a sign of ecclesiasticism, maleness, and "orthodoxy", from which some scholars wished to disassociate themselves', Elizabeth A. Clark, 'From Patristics to Early Christian Studies', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 14. Factors for this change included institutional factors, such as the rise of younger female scholars taking up roles in academia (who wanted to disassociate themselves with the above factors) and increasing interest in social history (research on women, slavery, writing, heresy, etc.). Even NAPS heatedly debated a name change. However, this change in nomenclature is predominately North American and has not made it over the pond. 'Patristic theology' remains a key course in major universities in the UK (Oxford, Durham, Cambridge, King's College London).

metaphorical room. Furthermore, is patristic exegesis not simply early Christian interpretation of scriptural texts? Is that not what we see in the dialogue gospels? In this study, I have attempted to show how GMary is part of the broader second-century Christian literary context. It is a gospel in the sense that it presents teachings from Jesus, and Jesus as a character; however, it can also fruitfully be used in dialogue with 'Patristic' authors. The 'church fathers' represent an emerging orthodoxy but such orthodoxy was not a monolith. Justin, Irenaeus and Clement, to name a few, were so diverse in many aspects of their thought that they can hardly be separated from early Christian writers whom we do not find on a Patristic syllabus.[11] The 'church fathers' were grappling with the same issues that we find in the 'apocryphal' literature written in the same period – theology, christology, eschatology, soteriology, and so forth.

Those texts that came to be included in the New Testament collection are not interested in different things than those texts that did not. The men that became 'church fathers' are not interested in different things to the authors they labelled as 'heretics'. They might endorse divergent theologies, but they have the same starting point in the figure of Jesus. If the aim is an understanding of history, then in order to further increase and deepen our awareness of the diversity and multiformity of the early Christian movement, we should give all remaining sources a fair hearing.

A number of factors were involved in canon formation and the construction of orthodoxy, but the NT and 'church father' texts are not intrinsically different to non-canonical texts and can be fruitfully read in comparison and contrast to each other. To demonstrate how NT scholars might apply their work to dialogue gospels, I have consciously sought to use the scholarship of those who do not work with non-canonical gospels, or 'gnosticism', or anything preserved in Coptic, and apply it to dialogue gospels. In my opinion, this endeavour, although not explicit anywhere in the thesis, has shown that the scholarly methods used for 'canonical' and 'orthodox' texts can be applied to non-canonical texts. The blurring of scholarly boundaries yields and enhances understanding.[12]

---

[11] Lehtipuu writes on Justin, Athenagoras and Clement: 'It is intriguing to ask whether these writers would have acknowledged each other as true Christians', Outi Lehtipuu, *Debates over the Resurrection of the Dead*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 206.

[12] Two examples of these are Edward Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*, Studies of the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000); T. J. Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century*, BZNW 219 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015).

Going forward, we might apply an open understanding of *genre* which allows various, even disparate, texts to be brought together for comparative analysis. Taxonomic constructions are useful as they allow texts to be played off of one another, allowing literary groupings to draw out both similarities and unique qualities of the texts being analyzed. The genre constructed in this thesis has been that of 'dialogue gospels', but the methods employed can be applied to a wider, narrower or completely different taxonomy, such as gospel literature, post-resurrection narratives or acts. Each of these constructions has the potential to build bridges between canonical and noncanonical literature, and consequently provide us with a fuller picture of the early Christian literary landscape.

Appendix 1. The *Gospel of Mary*: Coptic and Greek MSS

The *Gospel of Mary* exists for us today in three incomplete manuscripts. The fullest version is in the fifth-century Coptic codex *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (BG), but this has a six-page lacuna at the beginning and three pages missing in the middle. The extant material is pages 7–10 and 15–19, with a title on the final page. There are also two third-century Greek fragments, *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus L 3525* (POxy.GM) and *Papyrus Rylands 463* (PRyl.GM). They correspond to 9,13–10,6 and 17,5–19,1 of BG, respectively. It is almost certain that GMary was originally penned in the Greek language at some point in the second century.[1] It is probable that there were several more copies of GMary circulating between the third and fifth centuries. Neither POxy.GM nor PRyl.GM work as a *Vorlage* for the Coptic text, and so there must have been a MS that BG was based on.[2]

Working with GMary's extant manuscripts is challenging. We must deal with a hypothetical second-century author, two Greek scribes in the third century, a hypothetical translator and a fifth-century scribe writing in Coptic.[3] Often the art of textual analysis requires seeking the 'original' text, and so working with the earliest sources available but, in the case of GMary, they are small badly-damaged fragments.[4] The fullest text is not in the original language, several centuries later, and suffers from 10 missing pages.

---

[1] I follow this dating from other scholars. For example, Tuckett writes 'A clear *terminus ad quem* for the writing of the gospel is provided by the Greek fragments. The existence of two independent Greek manuscripts of the text from the early third century, along with some copying errors in them, means that the gospel must have been in existence by c.200 CE. Further, the evidence from the manuscripts, as noted above, suggests that the gospel must have existed in a number of copies. Thus the text is at latest a second-century production', Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Gospel of Mary* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 11. A more precise date is debated. King conjectures the first half of the second century, Karen L. King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', in *Searching the Scriptures, II: A Feminist Commentary*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 628. Pasquier argues for the second half, Anne Pasquier, *L'Évangile selon Marie*, BCNH:T 10 (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1983), 3–4.

[2] Whether a minimum of three Greek MSS in circulation implies a wide readership in the ancient world is debated – King argues that, '[b]ecause it is unusual for several copies from such early dates to have survived, the attestation of the Gospel of Mary as an early Christian work is unusually strong', Karen L. King, *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2003), 11. Hurtado, on the other hand, proposes that three Greek MSS 'hardly stands out' (he writes on the three Greek fragments of GThom), Larry W. Hurtado, 'The Greek Fragments of "The Gospel of Thomas" as Artefacts: Papyrological Observations on P. Oxy. 1, P.Oxy 654, and P. Oxy 655', in *Das Thomasevangelium: Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie*, ed. Jörg Frey, Enno Edzard Popkes, and Jens Schröter (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2008), 29. GMary is never quoted or referenced in any other extant literature.

[3] On an earlier edition of GMary in Coptic, see Walter C. Till and Hans-Martin Schenke, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, 2nd ed., TU 60 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972).

[4] The quest for the 'original' has started to change. Epp's excellent article on the term 'original text' and the quest to find it poses several important questions about scholarly approaches to textual criticism, Eldon Jay Epp, 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism', *HTR* 92, no. 3 (1999): 245–81. In light of these questions, certain scholars working on Nag Hammadi material have turned their attention to the fourth- or fifth-century *Coptic* manuscripts, without trying to ascertain what an original Greek might have looked like. These include: Eduard Iricinschi, 'Scribes and Readers of Nag Hammadi Codex II: Book Production and Monastic Paideia in Fourth-Century Egypt' (PhD Thesis, Princeton, 2009); Hugo Lundhaug, *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul*, NHMS 73 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010); Lance Jenott, *The Gospel of Judas:*

There are several reasons to assume that GMary underwent some degree of change between the second-century Greek and fifth-century Coptic text. In these centuries, text transmission was not orchestrated or controlled.[5] Second and third-century NT texts have 'been defined variously as "uncontrolled," "unstable," "wild," and "free"'.[6] And scribal modifications were often socially, theologically or ideologically motivated.[7] Translation makes this even more complicated; the conventions of the Coptic language necessitate certain changes to the meaning behind the Greek text. Shisha-Halevy points out:

> The [Coptic] translator 'improves' on the Greek, by necessity, since Coptic makes distinctions the Greek does not, and choice in the re-writing by the Coptic writer-translator must be made, by the exigencies of the Coptic system. This then often results in additional or different information being introduced into the text.[8]

It would be implausible to propose that the GMary of the Berlin Codex had not undergone significant modification since its original composition. The scribe lived centuries later and operated in a different language. ApJohn, which follows GMary in the codex (but exists in another three Coptic recensions) and looks to be written by the same hand, is the result of διασκευή, a revision including modification in detail.[9] Therefore, we should expect some changes in detail also in GMary.

Comparing the Greek GMary fragments to BG, the overall content appears to be very similar – but with slight details amended (see Appendix 3). In chapter three, I proposed that these changes in the Coptic MS demonstrate a situation of greater hostility between Mary and Levi on one side and

---

Coptic Text, Translation, and Historical Interpretation of 'the Betrayer's Gospel', STAC 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Ulla Tervahauta, *A Story of the Soul's Journey in the Nag Hammadi Library: A Study of Authentikos Logos (NHC VI,3)*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 107 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015). Iricinschi suggests that: 'If writers "produce" their texts, late antique scribes could be said to "reproduce" their texts' (75), and therefore we must read the later texts in their own right. However, GMary is available in earlier Greek fragments, and so reading this text is a delicate balance between understanding the gospel as a second-century Greek production and the (largely) extant text as a fifth-century Coptic work.

[5] As a small sample of recent work in this field: Frederick Wisse, 'The Coptic Versions of the New Testament', in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 131–41; Helmut Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Peterson, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19–37; David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[6] Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 106.

[7] Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 124; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), esp. 280.

[8] Ariel Shisha-Halevy, 'Future, Present, Narrative Past: a Triple Note on Oxyrhynchite Tempuslehre', *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft* 35, no. 3 (2003): 250–51.

[9] Pleše refers to this technique in the composition of ApJohn, Zlatko Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John*, NHMS 52 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 4, 7–20.

Peter and Andrew on the other. In the Greek fragments, Mary is the superior disciple; but in the BG, Mary is the superior disciple *at the expense of Peter.* Such small changes between the earlier Greek fragments and the later Coptic MS may amount to a larger modification in the meaning of the gospel. Although most of GMary's material on eschatology (the subject of chapters four and five) are not in the extant Greek, the possibility that what remains to us in Coptic is not quite the same as the second-century text must remain in mind.

(A) The Berlin Codex

The BG was discovered in 1896 at a Christian burial site near Panopolis, and the legend goes that it was hidden in a wall niche wrapped in feathers.[10] However, due to the good condition of the text, scholars contest this tale: '[I]t is thought to be unlikely that the codex can have been in such a location for any substantial length of time'.[11] After its discovery, the codex had a troublesome beginning in the academic world – floods, war, death – until it was published by Till in 1955, nearly 60 years after its discovery.[12] Since then, the papyrus has faded and certain letters in Till's 1955 (and 1972) and Pasquier's 1983 editions can no longer be read. The Coptic used is mainly Sahidic with elements of Subakhmimic. Sahidic was the most readable and widespread dialect among fourth-century unilingual Copts.

BG is a miniature codex and GMary was bound alongside the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* and an epitome of the *Act of Peter*.[13] GMary begins the 152-page codex, and so it may be considered the most authoritative text – as opposed to the Nag Hammadi codices 2, 3 and 4, in which ApJohn is the first text which has 'long been cited as indications of the importance of *Ap. John* itself'.[14] The final lines of GMary read ⲡ[ⲉ]ⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲅⲁⲙⲙ (19,3–5), and following this title, ApJohn begins immediately.

(B) Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3525

POxy.GM is a small, very fragmentary papyrus leaf, measuring just under 12cm high at its highest point and 11.5cm at its widest point. There is another fragment measuring ca. 0.6cm x 1cm, which is placed at the left hand side of the text, around line 5. The script is only found on one side of the

---

[10] Michel Tardieu and Jean-Daniel Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique. I: Collections retrouvées avant 1945* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986), 99–100; Esther A. de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary: Listening to the Beloved Disciple* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 12.
[11] Tuckett, *Mary*, 5. Also, King, *Mary*, 7.
[12] On the history of the MS and its 'mini-saga', see Tuckett, *Mary*, 5–6.
[13] The codex measures around 12.7cm long and 10.5cm wide.
[14] Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking 'Gnosticism': An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 248.

papyrus, indicating that it was part of a roll.[15] The fragment contains 18 decipherable lines of script but none are complete.[16] Line 3 contains the first legible letters. At the widest part of the papyrus (line 15), ca. 30 letters can be read.

The writing is a cursive script, which is uncommon for literary texts. The lines are not regular or straight (particularly the gap between lines 8 and 9 and the smaller size of the letters on line 16). Parsons (the editor of the *editio princeps*) writes: 'The script, and perhaps the roll-form, shows this to be an amateur copy'.[17] The cursive script is dated to the third century.[18] There is one nomen sacrum, ανθρωπους as $\overline{\alpha\nu\text{o}\overline{\upsilon}\varsigma}$ (POxy.GM); whereas κυριε (POxy GM.) is unusually written in full (κυριος was one of the earliest nomina sacra, and it is found abbreviated in all of the earliest Greek NT MSS[19]).

It would seem that POxy.GM was prepared for private use and by a scribe of modest literary ability. The general preference for Christian texts was the codex, and so the roll format is unusual. These two factors may suggest that this particular manuscript was used outside of a communal setting. Both POxy.GM and PRyl.GM were discovered on the rubbish heaps in Oxyrhynchus.[20]

(C) Papyrus Rylands 463

PRyl.GM is a small papyrus leaf measuring ca.8.8cm wide and 9.9cm long. Unlike POxy.GM, it is from a codex. The extant portion contains ca.15 decipherable lines on both the *recto* and *verso* side. The top of the fragment shows page numbers κα (21) and κβ (22). The start of 21 begins ΤΟΛΟΙΠΟΝ corresponding with BG 17,5, and the end of 22 is the end of GMary. The version of the gospel of PRyl.GM may have been longer than BG as it ends on page 22 but there is also more text on the Greek pages than on the Coptic.[21]

The original form of the papyrus is thought to have been a small codex.[22] Miniature codices were most likely made for private reading, possibly commissioned by the collector themselves.[23] The

---

[15] Hill cites the roll-format as artifactual evidence of its already-existing status as 'apocryphal', arguing that the texts of the fourfold gospel already belonged to a 'canonical consciousness' and thus were written on codices. Charles E. Hill, 'A Four-Gospel Canon in the Second Century? Artifact and Arti-Fiction', *EC* 4 (2013): 310–34.

[16] King states that the fragment has approximately twenty lines, whereas Tuckett states around 21. King, *Mary*, 11; Tuckett, *Mary*, 81.

[17] P. J. Parsons, '3525. Gospel of Mary.', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs, Vol. 50 70 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 12.

[18] Parsons, '3525. Gospel of Mary.', 12.

[19] Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism* (Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2005), 199.

[20] For discussion on the rubbish heaps, see AnneMarie Luijendijk, 'Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus', *VC* 64 (2010): 217–54.

[21] Till and Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, 25.

[22] Cf. POxy 1 which Hurtado deduces had a total page height of 27+ cm, Hurtado, 'The Greek Fragments of "The Gospel of Thomas" as Artefacts: Papyrological Observations on P. Oxy. 1, P.Oxy 654, and P. Oxy 655'.

[23] As the canonical gospels were generally found in larger codices, Hill suggests that miniature codices demonstrate that the text they contained may have had a non-canonical status in the milieu of a third-century "canonical consciousness". Hill, 'A Four-Gospel Canon in the Second Century? Artifact and Arti-Fiction', 324.

script is also suggestive of a private codex. At its publication, Roberts wrote: 'The text is written in a hand which, if clear and upright, is also ugly and ill-proportioned and shows considerable cursive influence'.[24] However, Tuckett has reviewed this assessment and concluded, 'it is clearly an uncial, not a cursive, hand'.[25] This may be in comparison to POxy.GM, which is barely decipherable to the untrained eye.[26]

PRyl.GM was dated by Roberts in the *editio princeps* to the early third century on palaeographic grounds.[27] The date has not subsequently been questioned. Like POxy.GM, PRyl.GM abbreviates ανθρωπον as $\overline{\alpha\nu\text{ο}\nu}$. In PRyl.GM σωτήρ is not abbreviated.[28] The inside margin (to the left of the *recto*) is relatively intact suggesting that the leaf may have fallen out of a codex rather than being torn out. The wear to the outside margin looks as though it was subject to time damage on the rubbish heaps of Oxyrhynchus.

---

[24] C. H. Roberts, '463: The Gospel of Mary', in *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), 20.
[25] Tuckett, *Mary*, 83.
[26] Parsons writes that the scribe of PRyl.GM is 'more professional' than the 'amateur' POxy.GM, Parsons, '3525: Gospel of Mary', 12.
[27] Roberts, '463: The Gospel of Mary', 20.
[28] Tuckett argues that this is unsurprising as σωτήρ was not abbreviated in manuscripts until the fourth century, Tuckett, *Mary*, 85.

Appendix 2. The *Gospel of Mary*: Text and Translations

Textual signs for the following editions and translations:

.   Dot underneath letter indicates uncertain letters

[ ]   Square brackets indicate a lacuna in the MS.

{ }   Braces indicate letters unnecessarily added by the scribe

< >   Pointed brackets indicate an editorial correction of a scribal omission or error.

` ´   High strokes indicate that the letter was written above the line by the scribe, as a correction.

cont.   The line has been continued from following section.

[[Double square brackets indicate an erased letter in the MS.

(A)   Text and Translation of Berlin Codex, 1, GMary

The following transcription of the Coptic text of GMary is based on photographs of the Berlin Codex, kindly sent to me by Christopher Tuckett, as well as the critical editions of Till/Schenke (1972),[1] Wilson/MacRae (1979),[2] Pasquier (1983)[3] and Tuckett (2007).[4] The translation here is my own.[5] Rather than offering the most fluent English translation possible, I have aimed to provide a relatively literal translation of the Coptic. I have provided limited textual and translation notes to highlight ambiguities in the MS and to bring to attention different possible translations of certain words.

---

[1] Till and Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*.

[2] R. McL. Wilson and George W. MacRae, "The Gospel According to Mary: BG, 1:7,1–19,5," in *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berlinensis 8502,1 and 4*. (ed. D. M. Parrott; NHS 11; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 456–471.

[3] Pasquier, *Marie*, 28–47.

[4] Tuckett, *Mary*, 86–106.

[5] Other English translations include King, *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala*, 13–18; Ardyth L. Bass, *Composition and Redaction in the Coptic Gospel of Mary* (Milwaukee, WI: PhD Thesis, Marquette University, 2007), 144–51; Bart Ehrman and Zlatko Plese, *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 587–600. Notes will also be to W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939).

(1) Dialogue between the Saviour and his Disciples (7,1–8,11)

[ⲍ]

[.] . [8+-   ] . . ⲑ[ⲩ]ⲗⲏ ⲟⲉ ⲛⲁ
ⲟⲩⲱ[ϭ]ⲡ ϫⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲉ
ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲕⲧⲓⲥⲓⲥ
ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩϣⲟⲡ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ {ⲙ}ⲛⲙ̄
ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉ
ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲧⲉ
ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲑⲩⲗⲏ ⲉⲥⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛⲁ
ⲧⲉⲥⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲁⲁ
ϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄
ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ϩⲱⲥ ⲁⲕⲧⲁ
ⲙⲟⲛ ⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϫⲱ ⲙⲡⲓⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ
ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ
ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ϣⲟⲡ ⲁⲗ
ⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧ̄ⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ
ⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧ̄ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ
ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲧ<ⲟⲩ>ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲛⲟ
ⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟ(ⲛ)
ϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲉ ϣⲁ ⲛⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ
ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ)
ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲓ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ
ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲱ
[ⲛ]ⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲧ[. . . . .]

[ⲏ]

ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲣ̄ . ⲡⲁ[. . . . . . ⲡ]ⲉⲧ[ⲣ̄]
ⲛⲟⲓ̈ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓ [ⲁⲑ]ⲩⲗⲏ ϫ[ⲡ]ⲉ ⲟⲩ
ⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ
ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲧⲟ
ⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲟⲩⲧⲁⲣⲁⲭⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲙ̄
ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲓ̈ϫⲟⲥ ⲛⲏ
ⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲏⲧ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲟ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲧⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲉ
ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲏⲧ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲛⲉ ⲡⲓⲛⲉ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄
ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

[7]

1   then will M[a]tter
     be dest[r]oyed or not?' The Saviour said,
     'Every nature, every form, every creature
     exist in (and) with each other
5   and will be dissolved again to
     their own root; for the
     nature of Matter is to dissolve to the elements
     (of) its nature alone. Whoever has ears
     to hear let him hear.'
10   Peter said to him, 'Since you have
     [to]ld us everything, say one other (thing)
     to us. What is the sin of the world?'
     The Saviour said, 'Sin does not exist
     but you make sin when you
15   do the things that are like the nature of
     adultery, which is called sin.'
     This is why the Good came
     into your midst to the things of
     every nature, so as to restore it inward
20   to its root. Then he continued
     and said, 'This is why you
     are si[c]k and you die, for [. . . . .]

[8]

1   of the one who [. . . . . . who]ever
     understands, let him understand. [Mat]ter [produc]ed a
     passion without likeness,
     which came forth unnaturally.
5   Then a disturbance occurs in
     the whole body. That is why I told you
     (to) be united in heart
     and if you are disjointed, nevertheless
     be united in the presence of each likeness
10   of the nature. Whoever has ears
     to hear, let him hear.'

<u>Textual issues</u>

7,1. The reading of ⲑⲩⲗⲏ is unclear. ⲑⲩⲗⲏ follows Till, Wilson/MacRae, Pasquier and Tuckett. | **7,2**. ⲟⲩⲱϭⲡ: Wilson/MacRae write '[t]he traces of letters seem to fit ⲟⲩⲱϭⲡ better than ⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ "saved"', Wilson/MacRae, 456. | **7,16**. <ⲟⲩ> supplied, following Wilson/MacRae, Pasquier, Tuckett. | **7,21–22**. Till, 62, reads ϣⲱ[ⲡ]ⲉ 'come into being'. | **7,22–8,1**. ⲧ[ⲉⲧⲛⲙⲉ] ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲁⲣ̅ⲡ̅ⲁ[ⲧⲁ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲡ]ⲉⲧ[ⲣ̅] 'for you love that which deceives you', Till/Schenke.

<u>Translation issues</u>

7,5. ⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ: 'resolved' in Wilson/MacRae, Bass. Pasquier adds a verb in her translation to emphasize the point of returning: 'qu'elles retourneront se dissoudre', Pasqiuer, 31. Presumably 'retourneront' is based on ⲟⲛ. | **7,6**. ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ is singular: 'their root'. Cf. 'roots', Wilson/MacRae, Tuckett, Bass. | **7,7**. 'to the elements of': Wilson/MacRae, 457, write 'the context suggests roots' but 'the essence of' is possible. | **7,16–20**. No other translations read this as the comment of the narrator. | **7,18**. 'your midst': Cf. 'among you', Tuckett. | **8,7**. The intransitive rendering of ⲧⲱⲧ can be translated as 'joined' 'persuaded' or 'agreeable', Crum, 473b. However, with ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ, Crum limits the translation to 'content heart, persuade, satisfy', 438a. However, this appears to be disregarded in other translations: 'obedient', Tuckett, 89; 'obéissants', Pasquier, 33; 'of good courage', Wilson/MacRae, 459, Bass, 145. The translation 'united' fits better for the message of GMary as Mary warns the others against making their hearts into two (ⲙ̅ⲡ̅ⲣ̅ⲣ̅ ϩⲏⲧ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ [9,15–16]).

(2) The Saviour's Farewell Discourse (8,11–9,5)

Coptic	Line	Translation
ⲛⲧⲁ	11_cont.	When
ⲣⲉϥϫⲉ ⲛⲁï ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲁϥⲁⲥ		the Blessed One had said these things, he
ⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟʼⲟʹⲥ		said farewell to them all, saying,
ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ		'Peace to you. My peace
ϫⲡⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲣ̄	15	acquire in you. Beware, do not allow anyone to lead
ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ		you astray saying,
ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉïⲥⲁ ⲏ̣ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉ ⲙ̄		"Look in this direction, or look in
ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥ		this place". For the Son of Man
ϣⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲉϩⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄		exists within you. Follow
ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁ	20	him. Those who seek him will
ϩⲛⲧϥ̄ ⲃⲱⲕ ϭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ		find him. Go then and preach
ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄		the gospel of the kingdom. Do not
ⲑ	[9]	
ⲕⲁ ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲣⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁï ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲉⲛ	1	lay down any rules beyond what
ⲧⲁïⲧⲟϣϥ̄ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ϯ ⲛⲟ		I have appointed for you, nor give
ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲑⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟ		a law like the Lawgiver
ⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ		in case you be dominated by it.'
ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉϥϫⲉ ⲛⲁï ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ	5	When he had said these things, he departed.

Textual issues

8,22. ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄. Cf. Till, 64, ⲙ̣[ⲡⲓ]. | **9,2.** ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ϯ on MS. Cf. Till, 66, ⲙ̄ⲡⲓϯ.

Translation issues

8,13. ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ from ἀσπάζομαι is usually translated as 'greeted' as Wilson/MacRae, Tuckett, Bass; 'salua', Pasquier. However, it can also be used as to 'say farewell', e.g. Acts 20.1, 21.6. | **8,15.** ϫⲡⲟ″ 'acquire' as in Crum, 779a. Cf. 'receive', Wilson/MacRae, Tuckett, Bass. The translation 'acquire' stresses the active participation of the disciples. | **9.3.** ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ has no article but is presumably singular in view of ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ (9,4) which refers back to the law.

(3) Mary's Arising (9,5–22)

Coptic		English
ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ	5cont.	But they
ⲛⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲉⲩ		were grieved, they wept much,
ϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ		saying, 'How shall we go
ϣⲁ ⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛ̄		to the nations and preach
ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡϣ`ⲏ′		the gospel of the kingdom of the
ⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄	10	Son of Man? If they did not
ⲡⲟⲩϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲉⲩ		spare him, how will they
ⲛⲁϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲧⲱ		spare us?' Then Mary
ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲥⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ		rose, she greeted them all,
ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ⲛⲛⲉⲥ`ⲥ′ⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲣⲓⲙⲉ		she said to her brothers, 'Do not weep
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ ϩⲏⲧ	15	and do not grieve and do not
ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲧⲉϥⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ		doubt! For his grace will be
ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲥⲣ̄ⲥⲕⲉⲡⲁ		with you all and will protect
ⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̄		you. Rather let us
ⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟϭ ϫⲉ ⲁϥⲥⲃ̄		give thanks for his greatness, for he has prepared
ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁϥⲁⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉⲙⲁ	20	us, he has made us Men.' When
ⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲁⲥⲕⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲩϩⲏⲧ		Mary had said these things, she turned their mind
[ⲉϩ]ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ		[t]o the Good.

Textual Issues

9,17. ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̄: Wilson/MacRae, 460, write that there is only room for one letter and reconstruct ⲧⲏⲣⲥ. This would presumably make the sense: 'For all of his grace will be with you'. But the word order makes this doubtful, as ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ and ⲧⲏⲣⲥ have three words between them. Till/Schenke, 66, write: 'Es muß ⲧⲏⲣⲧⲛ heißen, obwohl nach der Photographie nur ein Buchstabe Platz zu haben scheint'. Pasquier, 34, follows with ⲧⲏⲣ<ⲧ>ⲛ̄, and King, 15, 'with you all'. Cf. Wilson/MacRae, 461, and Tuckett, 91, use ⲧⲏⲣⲥ and translate 'entirely with you' and 'wholly with you' respectively. To translate 'wholly', the word should be ⲉ-ⲧⲏⲣ″, Crum, 424b.

Translation Issues

9,10. ⲣⲱⲙⲉ is gender inclusive and should be translated as 'human'. However, the phrase 'the Son of Man' is so familiar in the study of the New Testament and Early Christianity that I have decided to use it here and later ('Men' 9,20; 'Perfect Man' 18,16). | **9,15–16.** ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ ϩⲏⲧⲥⲛⲁⲩ lit. 'do not make heart two'.

(4) Peter's Request to Mary (9,22–10,9)

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲣ̅ⲁⲣⲭⲉ	22cont.	And they beg[an]
[ⲥⲑⲁⲓ] ⲛ̅ⲣ̅ⲅⲩⲙ[ⲛ]ⲁⲍⲉ ϩⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ϣⲁ		to de[b]ate the wor[ds]
[ⲭ]ⲉ ⲙⲡ[ⲥⲱⲣ]		of the [Saviour].

ï		[10]
ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲙⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲭⲉ ⲧⲥⲱ	1	Peter said to Mary, 'Sister
ⲛⲉ ⲧⲛ̅ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲟⲩⲁϣⲉ		we know that the Saviour loved you
ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲕⲉⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥ̅ϩⲓⲙⲉ		more than the other women.
ⲭⲱ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ϣⲁⲭⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲉⲓⲣⲉ		Tell us the words of the Saviour that you
ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁï ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ	5	remember, those that you know and
ⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲛ̅ⲥⲟⲧⲙ`ⲟʹⲩ		we do not, nor have we heard them.'
ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̅ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲥ		Mary answered and said,
ⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅ ϯⲛⲁⲧⲁⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲩ		'What is hidden from you, I will proclaim to
ⲧⲛ̅ ⲉⲣⲟϥ		you.'

Textual Issues

9,24. ⲥⲱⲣ cannot be read, but it is highly probable.

227

(5) Mary's Vision (10,9–23)

Coptic		English
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϫⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ	9cont.	And she began to say to them
ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ϫⲉ ⲁ{ⲓ}ⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ⲁⲓ	10	these words: 'I', she said, 'I
ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡ̄ⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲍⲛ ⲟⲩⲍⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲉⲓ		saw the Lord in a vision and I
ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲡ̄ⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙ̄		said to him, "Lord, I saw you
ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲍⲛ ⲟⲩⲍⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲡⲉ		today in a vision." He answered
ϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲓ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲓⲙ ⲁⲛ		and said to me, "Blessed (are) you, for you did not
ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲥ	15	waver as you saw me. For where the mind
ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲍⲟ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲓ̈		is, there is the treasure." I said
ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲡ̄ⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲧ̣ⲉ̣ⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϥⲟ		to him, "Lord, now the one who sees the
ⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ <ⲍⲛ̄> ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ <ⲏ>		vision, does he see it through the Soul or
ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲥⲱⲣ ⲡⲉ		the Spirit?" The Saviour answered and
ϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲟⲩ	20	said, "He sees not through the Soul
ⲇⲉ ⲍⲙ ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲉⲧϣ[ⲟⲡ]		nor through the Spirit, but the Mind, which is
ⲍⲛ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ[ϥ ⲡⲉⲧ]		between the two. [It is that which]
ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϥⲟⲣⲟⲙⲁ ⲁⲩ[ⲱ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡ[ⲉⲧ . . .]		sees the vision an[d] it is that [which . . .]

Textual Issues

10,10. ⲁⲛⲟⲕ, Till, Wilson/MaRae, Tuckett. 'Or - less probably - ⲁⲓⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ', Tuckett, 92. | **10,17.** ⲧ̣ⲉ̣ⲛⲟⲩ following Till and Wilson/MacRae. Wilson/MacRae write that others have read ⲡ̣ⲛ̣ⲟⲩⲥ but do not name their source and I have not found it. | **10,18.** MS reads ⲏ̣ ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲍⲙ̄ (the Soul in the Spirit), but the emendation is necessary in view of the ascent of the Soul after the lacuna.

Pages 11 to 14 missing.

(6) The Ascent of the Soul (15,1–17,9)

ιε

ммоч ауω пеϫε τεπιθγμια
ϫε ᴍπιναγ еро еревнк епιτᴎ
тенογ ᴅе †ναγ еро еревнк е
тпе πωс ᴅе теϫι ϭολ еренπ´ е
рοеі асογωϣᴃ ᴎϭι τεψγχη πε
ϫας ϫε аïναγ еро ᴍπεναγ ероï
оγᴅе ᴍπεειμε ероеі нееιϣο
оп не ᴎϩᴃϭω ауω ᴍπесογωнт
ᴎταресϫе ναï асвωк естεληλ
ᴎϩογο | παλιν асеі етᴎ тмеϩ
ϣомнте ᴎнеϩογсιа тетογᴎ´ο´γ
те ерос ϫе тᴍᴎτатсоογν [ас]ᴩ
еϩетаϩе ᴎτεψγχη есϫ[ω ᴍ]
мос ϫе еревнк етωн ϩᴎ [о]γπο
ннрια ауамаϩте ᴍмо аγ[а]ᴍаϩ
те ᴅе ᴍмо ᴍπᴩкρινε аγ[ω] пе
ϫе τεψγχη ϫе аϩро еркрινε
ᴍмоï емπικρινε аγемаϩте
ᴍмоï емπιамаϩте ᴍпоγϭογ
ωнт анок ᴅе аïсογωνογ еγ
вωλ евол ᴍπτнρч еιτε να π
каϩ

1 'it. And Desire said,
"I did not see you descending,
but now I see you ascending.
Why then do you lie (since) you belong
5 to me?" The Soul answered
and said, "I saw you. You did not see me
nor did you know me. I was
to you garments and you did not recognize me."
When she had said these things, she departed rejoicing
10 greatly. | Again she came into the hand of the
third of the powers, the one that is called
Ignorance. [She]
questioned the Soul, sa[yi]ng,
"Where are you going? In
15 [w]ickedness, they bound you. You are indeed
b[o]und. Do not judge." An[d] the
Soul said, "Why do you judge
me? I did not judge. They bound
me; I did not bind. They did not
20 recognize me; but I recognized them.
All things are dissolving, both the things of the
earth

ιϛ

еιτе να тπ[е] ᴎтеретеψγχη оγ
ωсч ᴎτмеϩϣомнте ᴎнеϩογсι
а асвωк епса нтпе ауω асναγ
етмаϩчтое ᴎнеϩογсιа асᴩ са
ϣче ᴍморφн тϣорπ ᴍмор
φн пе пкаке тмеϩсᴎте теπ
θγмια тмеϩϣомнте тᴍᴎτат
соογν тмеϩчтое пе пкωϩ ᴍπ
моγ тмеϩ†е те тᴍᴎτеро ᴎтсарϩ
тмеϩсое те тᴍᴎτсавн нсеϭн
ᴎсарϩ тмеϩсаϣче те тсоφι
а [ᴎ]речноγϭс наï не тсаϣче ᴎ
ne[ϩ]оγсιа нте торгн еγϣιне

1 and the things of the heav[en]." When the
Soul had destroyed the third of the powers
she went upwards and saw
the fourth of the powers. She made
5 seven forms. The first form
is Darkness, the second is
Desire; the third, Ignorance;
the fourth is Zeal for
Death; the fifth is Kingdom of Flesh;
10 the sixth is Foolish Wisdom of
Flesh; the seventh is Wisdom
[of the] Wrathful One. These are the seven
p[o]wers of Wrath. They ask

229

ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲓⲛ ⲧⲱⲛ   the Soul, "Where do you come from

ⲧ̣ϩⲁⲧ̅ⲃ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏ ⲉⲣⲉⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ   15   Human-Slayer? Or, where do you go

ⲧⲟⲩ̣ⲁⲥϥⲙⲁ ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲧⲉ   Space-Destroyer?" The Soul

ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄   answered and said, "That which bound

ⲙⲟⲓ̈ ⲁⲩⲕⲟⲛⲥϥ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲧⲟ ⲙ̄   me has been slain and that which surrounds

ⲙⲟⲓ̈ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲟⲥϥ<ϥ> ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ   me has been destroyed. And my Desire

ⲁⲥϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩ̄   20   deceased and Ignorance

ⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩ ˋϩⲛ̄ˊ ⲟⲩ[ⲕⲟⲥ]ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲃⲟⲗⲧˊ ⲉ   died. In a [wor]ld I was dissolved

ⲓⲍ   [17]

ⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩ]ⲱ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩ   1   from a world, [an]d in a

ⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄   type from a type which is

ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲙⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛⲧⲃ̄ϣⲉ ⲉⲧ   above, and the chain of forgetfulness which

ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲓ̈ϣ ϫⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ   exists only for a while. From this time on,

ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲡⲉ   5   I will receive Rest from the

ⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲙⲡˋⲁⲓˊⲱⲛ ϩⲛ̄   time of the season of the age, in

ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲙⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ϫⲉ   silence.'" When Mary had said

ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲁⲥⲕⲁⲣⲱⲥ ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲥⲱⲣ   these things, she was silent as the Saviour

ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ   had spoken with her to this point.

Textual Issues

15,15–16. Double ⲁⲩⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ. Wilson/MacRae, 463, suggest a possible dittography. But it is more likely that it is included for emphasis due to the inclusion of ϫⲉ. | **15,17.** ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ seems a natural fit, particularly due to ⲉⲙⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ (15,18). | **15,22.** ⲕⲁϩ is read underneath ⲡ. It is the only word on line 22. The reading of ⲕⲁϩ is disputable but fits well in opposition to ⲡⲉ (16,1). | **16,5** The MS reads ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ with ⲛ and ⲙ̄ joined which is 'presumably the scribe's attempt to correct a false start', Wilson/MacRae, 464. | **16,13** ⲛⲉ[ϩ]ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ: Till/Schenke reads ⲙⲉ[ⲧ]ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ, 'participants'. ⲛⲉϩⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ 'seem[s] to fit... equally well', Wilson/MacRae, 465, and it is also used in 15,11 and 16,4. | **16,19.** MS reads ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲟⲥϥ. It should read ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲟⲥϥϥ. | **16,21.** ϩⲛ̄ inserted by scribe above the line.

Translation Issues

15,4. 'Since' supplied by Wilson/MacRae, Pasquier and Tuckett. | **15,8.** Tuckett inserts 'simply' as in 'I was to you (simply) a garment' Tuckett, 95. Cf. 'I served you as a garment', Wilson/MacRae. | **15,8.** ⲛ̄ϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ is plural: 'the garments'. Cf. 'a garment' in Wilson/MacRae and Tuckett. | **15,10.** ⲉⲧⲛ̄ can have the sense of coming into the hand of (ⲧⲱⲣⲉ/ⲧⲟⲟⲧ-), Crum, 61b. This translation shows the powers (false) sense of authority. See also 'tomba aux mains de', Pasquier. Other translations simply read 'it came to the third power', Wilson/MacRae and Tuckett. | **15,16–20.** These clauses can be translated in an active or passive sense: 'they bound you' or 'you are bound'. Wilson/MacRae, Tuckett and King use the passive. However, the final clause, ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϫⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲟⲩ, refers to the antecedent 'they', and so it would be consistent to use the active sense. | **15.20–22.** Tuckett and King translators place the things being dissolved as the subject of the Soul's recognition: 'I have recognized *that* the All is being dissolved'. This does not seem to work grammatically.

(7) Controversy over Mary's Vision (17,10–18,15)

ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̅ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲁⲛⲇⲣⲉⲁⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ
ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁϫⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϫⲱ
ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϧⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥϫ[ⲟ]ⲟⲩ
ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲙⲉⲛ ϯⲣ̅ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ
ⲁⲡⲥⲱ̅ⲣ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲥⲃⲟⲟⲩ
ⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛ̅ⲕⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱ
ϣⲃ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϧⲁ ⲡⲣⲁ
ⲛⲛⲉⲉⲓϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲁϥ
ϫⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲥⲱ̅ⲣ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏⲧⲓ
ⲁϥϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓ̈ⲙⲉ ⲛϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ
ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲛ <ⲟⲩ>ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲛⲛ̀ⲁ
ⲕⲧⲟⲛ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ ⲧⲏⲣ̅ⲛ̅
ⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ

10 Then Andrew answered and said
to the brothers, 'Say whatever you say
about what she said.
I myself do not believe that
the Saviour said such things,
15 for surely these are alien teachings.'
Peter answered, he spoke about
such matters. He
asked them about the Saviour, 'Did
he speak with a woman secretly
20 (and) not openly to us? Are we to
turn and all listen
to her? Did he choose her over us?'

ⲓⲏ

ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁ[ⲙ]ⲁⲣⲓϩⲁⲙ ⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ ⲙ̅
ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ <ϫⲉ> ⲡⲁⲥⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ ϩⲓ̈ⲉ ⲉⲕ
ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲓ
ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲧ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲁ
ϩⲏⲧ ⲏ ⲉⲉⲓϫⲓ ϭⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲥⲱ̅ⲣ ⲁϥⲟⲩ
ⲱϣⲃ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲗⲉⲩⲉⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟ`ⲥ′
ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ ϫⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲕϣⲟⲡ ⲛⲣⲉϥ
ⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ ϯⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲣ̅
ⲅⲩⲙⲛⲁⲍⲉ ⲉϩⲛ ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ⲑⲉ ⲛ̅
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲧⲓⲕⲉⲓⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲁⲡ
ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲝⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ
ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ⲉⲛⲟϫⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱ`ⲥ′
ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲥ
ⲫⲁⲗⲱⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲟϣⲥ̅ ⲛϩⲟⲩ
ⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ

[18]

1 Then Mary wept. She said to
Peter, 'My brother Peter, what do you
think then? Do you think that I
have thought of these (things) myself in my
5 heart, or that I am lying about the Saviour?' Levi
answered, he said to Peter,
'Peter you are always
wrathful! I see you now
disputing with the woman like
10 the adversaries. If the
Saviour made her worthy, who are you
to reject her? Surely
the Saviour knew her
infallibly, and therefore he loved her more
15 than us.

(8) Levi's Final Words and the End (18,15–9,5)

Coptic	Line	English
ⲘⲀⲖⲖⲞⲚ ⲘⲀⲢⲚ̄ϢⲒⲠⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄	15	Rather, let us be ashamed and
† ϩⲓⲰⲰⲚ ⲘⲠⲢⲰⲘⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲖⲒⲞⲤ		put on the Perfect Man
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄ϪⲠⲞϥ ⲚⲀⲚ ⲔⲀⲦⲀ ⲐⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϥ		and acquire him for ourselves as he
ϩⲰⲚ ⲈⲦⲞⲞⲦⲚ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄ⲦⲀϢⲈⲞⲈⲒϢ		commanded us and preach
ⲘⲠⲈⲨⲀⲅⲅⲈⲖⲒⲞⲚ ⲈⲚⲔⲰ ⲀⲚ ⲈϩⲢⲀⲒ̈		the gospel, not laying down
ⲚⲔⲈϩⲞⲢⲞⲤ ⲞⲨⲆⲈ ⲔⲈⲚⲞⲘⲞⳬ ⲠⲀ	20	other rules or another la[w] beyond
ⲢⲀ ⲠⲈⲚⲦⲀⲠⲤⲰⲢ ϪⲞⲞϥ [Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲢⲈ]		what the Saviour told us. [When]
[Ⲓ]Ⲑ		[19]
[8+-] ⲀⲒ̈ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲀⲨⲢ̄ⲀⲢⲬⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄	1	[8+-] and they began to
ⲂⲰⲔ [ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲦ]ⲀⲘⲞ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲈⲦⲀϢⲈⲞⲈⲒϢ		depart [to tea]ch and to preach.
Ⲡ[Ⲉ]ⲨⲀⲅⲅⲈⲖⲒⲞⲚ		[The Gos]pel
ⲔⲀⲦⲀ		according to
ⲘⲀⲢⲒϩⲀⲘⲘ	5	Mary

Textual Issues

18,17. Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄ϪⲠⲞϥ ⲚⲀⲚ ⲔⲀⲦⲀ from Wilson/MacRae, 'Mary', 468. Cf. Till: Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄[.......ⲔⲀⲦ]Ⲁ, Till, *BG*, 76. | **19,1.** Missing eight letters reconstructed: [ⲖⲈⲨⲈⲒ ⲆⲈ ϪⲈ Ⲛ], Till, *BG*, 78. | **19,2.** Reconstruction ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲦ supplied by Till, *BG*, 78.

(B)   Text and Translation of POxy.GM

The following transcription of the Greek text of POxy.GM mainly follows that found in Tuckett's most recent critical edition, with small changes.[6] Other critical editions include Parsons (1983)[7] and Lührmann (2004).[8] As the MS is so fragmentary and much of the below is reconstruction, I have put the extant letters in larger bold font. An image of the Greek fragment can be found online at *Oxyrhynchus Online: Image Database.*

<div align="center">

ου̣δε νο̣μ̣[ον

....
</div>

5.   τ]αυτα ειπων {αυ}< ε>ξ[ηλθεν οι δε λυπηθησαν

δακρουντες πολλα και] λεγοντες· πως π[ορευωμεθα προς τα εθνη

κηρυσσοντες το ευα]γγελιον τη[ς] β[ασιλειας του υιου του ̅α̅ν̅ο̅υ̅ ει

γαρ μηδ εκεινου εφεισα]γτο πως ημων φ[εισονται τοτε αναστασα Μαρι

αμμη και ασπαζομενη α]υτους κατεφιλησε̣ [αυτους και ειπεν τοις αδελφοις αυτης

10.   μη δακρυετε μη λυπ]εισθε μηδε δισταζετε̣ι [η χαρις γαρ αυτου εσται

μ]ε̣θ̣ υμων σ̣κεπουσα υμας μαλλον ευ[[.]]χαρι̣[στωμεν τη μεγαλει

οτ]η̣τ̣ι̣ αὐ(ου) οτι συγηρτηκεν ημας και ̅α̅ν̅ο̅[υ̅ς̅ πεποιηκεν ουτω λεγουσα

Μαρια]μ̣μ̣η μετεστρεψεν τον νουν αυτων ε̣[π αγαθον και ηρξαν συν

ζη]τ̣[ει]ν περι των αποφθεγματων του σωτηρ[ος λεγει Πετρος

15.   προ]ς Μαριαμμην· αδελφη οιδαμεν οτι πολλ[α ηγαπημενη ης υπο του

σωτ]ηρος ω̣ς ουκ αλλη γυνη ειπον ουν ημειν ο̣[σους συ γινωσκεις

λογο]υς του σωτηρος [ους] η̣μ̣ε̣ι̣ς ουκ ηκουσαμε̣ν̣ υπ̣ε̣[λαβε Μαριαμμη λεγου

σα οσα υμ]α̣ς λανθανει και απομνημονευω α̣γ̣α̣[γγελω υμιν και ηρχεν αυ

τοις του]τω̣ν των λὀ(ων)· εμ[οι] ποτε εν οροματι ιδ[................

20.   ....] κ̣υ̣ρι̣ε̣ σημερον

<div align="center">

βε
</div>

---

[6] Tuckett, *Mary*, 108.

[7] P. J. Parsons, '3525: Gospel of Mary', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Graeco-Roman Memoirs*, Vol. 50 70 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 12–14.

[8] Dieter Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien: Studien zu Neuen Texten und zu Neuen Fragen*, NovTSupp 112 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004), 108–9.

nor a l[aw

....

5.   **When he has said this he de**[parted. But they were grieved,

weeping much and] **saying, 'How are we to g**[o to the nations

and preach the go]**spel of the k**[ingdom of the Son of Man? For if

they did not spare him,] **how will they s**[pare us?' Then Mary arising,

and greeting th]**em, kissed** [them, and said to her brothers,

10.   'Do not weep, do not grie]**ve, do not doubt!** [For his grace will be

w]**ith you protecting you. Rather let** [us] **give than**[ks for his great-

ness] **for he has united us and** [has made us M]**en.** [When she had said these things,

Mar]**y turned their mind to** [the Good. And they began to

deba]**te the sayings of the Saviou**[r. Peter said

15.   to] **Mary, 'Sister, we know that you were greatly l**[oved by the

Savi]**our like no other woman. Tell us** [those words that you know

of the Saviour** [which] **we have not heard.'** [Mary answered, saying,

'What is] **unknown to you and I remember, I will pr**[oclaim to you'. And she began

(saying) to them th]**ese words, 'To m**[e] **once in a vision** [..........

20.   ....] **"Lord, today … '**

Textual Issues

3. ουδεν in Parsons and Lührmann. | **5.** α̣.ξ[ηλθεν] in Parsons. Lührmann reads ἐξ[ηλθεν]. | **16.** Parsons, Lührmann and Tuckett has απα̣[γγελω], but the verb αναγγελω is also possible. | **20.** Lührmann reconstructs the line as: [ειπον ·] κυρι̣ε σημερον σ[ε ειδον.] υπελαβε λεγ[ων · μακαρια ει συ . . .]

(C)   Text and Translation of PRyl.GM

The following transcription of the Greek text of PRyl.GM mainly follows that found in Tuckett's most recent critical edition, with small changes.[9] Other critical editions include Roberts (1938)[10] and Lührmann (2004).[11] An image of the Greek fragment can be found online at *Manchester Digital Collections*.

Recto (→)

κ̣α   21

το λοιπον δρομου και[ρο]υ χρονου   1   the remainder of (the) course of seas[on], of time,

αιωνος αναπαυσιν ε[ν] σιγη· ταυ   of age, (in) Rest i[n] silence.

τ[α] ειπουσα η Μαριαμμη εσιωπη   When she had said these thin[gs], Mary was silen[t]

σε[ν] ως του σωτηρος μεχρι ωδε   as the Saviour had spoken to this point.

ειρηκοτος Ανδρεας λεγε[ι α]δελ   5   Andrew says, 'Brothers,

φοι τι υμειν δοκει πε[ρ]ι των {π̣ε̣   what does it seem to you abo[u]t what

ρι των} λαληθεντων εγω̣ μεν   has been said? For I myself

γαρ ου πιστευω ταυτ[[ε]]ʽἀ <τ>[ο]ν σ[ω   do not believe that t[h]e S[a]viour

τηρα ειρηκεναι· εδοκει γ[αρ ετε   said such things, f[or] they seem to [be

ρογνωμονειν τη εκ[ε]ιν[ου εν   10   di]fferent from h[is i]dea.

νοια <πετρος λεγει> περι τοιουτ[ω]ν πρα[γμα   (Peter said), asking about

των εξεταζομενος ο̣ σω[τηρ]   such matters, 'Did the Savi[our]

λαθρα γυγ[α]ικι ελαλει και <ου> φ[α   speak secretly with a wo[m]an and not

νερως ινα παντες ακους[ωμεν   o[p]enly, so that [we] all might listen?

μη α]ξιολογωτεραν η[.]ω̣ν[…   15   [Is she m]ore worthy of esteem than us?

ε̣

Textual Issues
6–7. περι των ουδεν: dittography. | **8.** ταυτα corrected on papyrus. <τ>[ο]ν: Papyrus reads σ[.]ν. | **11.** πετρος λεγει not on MS. | **13.** ου not on MS.

[9] Tuckett, *Mary*, 112–15.
[10] C. H. Roberts, '463: The Gospel of Mary', in *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), 18–23.
[11] Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 112–13.

Verso (↓)

<div style="display:flex">
<div>

κβ

του σωτηρος Λευε[ι]ς λεγει Πετρῳ

Πετρε ἀ[ει] σο[ι] το οργιλον· παρακει

ται και αρτι ουτως συνζητει[ς] τη

γυναικι ως αντικειμενος αὐτη

ει ο σωτη[ρ] αξιαν αυτην ηγησατο

σὺ τις ει ἐξουθενων αυτην παν

τως γαρ ἐκεινος ειδως αυτην ἀσ

φ[αλ]ῳ[ς] ηγαπησεν μαλλ[ο]ν αισχυ[ν]

θῳ[με]ν και ενδυσαμενο[ι] τον

τ[ελειο]ν α̅ν̅ο̅ν̅ εκεινο το προστα<χ>

θ[εν η]μειν π[ο]ιησωμεν κηρυσ{ε}

ϲ[ειν το] ευαγγ[ε]λιον μηδεν ο[ρ]ιζον

τ[ες μ]ηδε νομοθετ[ο]υντες ως ει

π[εν ο] σωτηρ [ταυ]τα ειπων ο Λευ

[εις με]ν απ[ελθων] ηρχεν

κη[ρυσσειν το ευαγγελι]ον [κατα Μαριαμ]

</div>
<div>

22

1   of the Saviour'. Lev[i] says to Peter,

     'Peter, wrath is always with yo[u],

     and so now you are disputing with the

     woman like an adversary to her.

5   If the Saviour deemed her worthy

     who are you to reject her?

     For surely he, knowing her i[n]fallib[ly], loved

     (her). Rath[e]r l[et] us be as[h]amed

     and having put on the

10   P[erfec]t Man, let [u]s do what

     was comm[an]ded us, to pre[ach

     the] gos[p]el, la[yi]ng down nothing

     [n]or law-making, as [the]

     Saviour sai[d]. When he had said [the]se things

15   Levi dep[arted] and he began

     to p[reach. The Gosp]el [according to Mary.]

</div>
</div>

Textual Issues
4. αντικειμενος: αντικειμενοι in Tuckett, but the remains of the letter on the MS suggest Σ.

236

Appendix 3. The *Gospel of Mary*: Synopses of the Greek and Coptic MSS

BG 9,22–10,17

'Do not lay down any rules beyond what I
have appointed for you, nor give a law like
the Lawgiver in case you be dominated by it.'

When he had said these things, he departed.
But they were grieved, they wept much,
saying, 'How shall we go to the nations and
preach the gospel of the kingdom of the Son
of Man?   If they did not spare him, how
will they spare us?'

Then Mary rose, she greeted them **all,**
                                she said to her brothers,
'Do not weep **and** do not grieve **and** do not
doubt! For his grace will be with you **all** and
will protect you. Rather let us give thanks
for his greatness, for he has **prepared** us,
he has made us Men.'

When **Mary** had said these things, she
turned their mind to the Good. And they
beg[an] to de[b]ate the **wor[ds]** of the
[Saviour].

Peter said to Mary, 'Sister, we know that
**the Saviour loved you more than the other
women.** Tell us the words of the Saviour **that
you remember**, those   that you know
and we do not, nor have we heard **them**.'

Mary answered and said, 'What is **hidden
from you**,   I will proclaim to
you.' And she began to say to them these
words: '**I**', she said, '**saw the Lord** in a
vision, and I said **to him**, "Lord, I saw you
today in a vision."'

POxy.GM

                            nor   a l[aw

When he had said these things, he de[parted.
But they were grieved, weeping much and]
saying, 'How shall we g[o to the nations and
preach the go]spel of the k[ingdom of the Son
of Man? **For** if they did not spare him,] how
will they s[pare us?'

Then Mary, rising and greeting th]em, **kissed
[them**   and said to her brothers,
'Do not weep,   do not grie]ve,   do not
doubt! [For his grace will be w]ith you
protecting you. Rather let [us] give than[ks
for his greatness,] for he has **united** us **and**
[he has made us M]en.'

 [When she had said these things, **Mar]y**
turned their mind to [the Good. And they
began to deba]te the **sayings** of the
Saviou[r.

Peter said to] Mary, 'Sister, we know that
**you were greatly l[oved by the Savi]our like
no other woman.** Tell us
               [those words that you know]
of the Saviour [which] we have not heard.'

[Mary answered, saying, 'What is] **unknown
to you and I remember**,   I will pr[oclaim to
you'. And she began (saying) to them th]ese
words,   '**To m[e] once** in a
vision [................]   "Lord,
today..."'

BG 17,5–19,5	PRyl.GM

'(From this time on, I will receive) **Rest, from the time of the season of the age,** in silence.'''

       the remainder of (the) course of season, of time, of age, (in) Rest i[n] silence.

When **Mary** had said these things, **she** was silent, as the Saviour had spoken **with her** to this point.

When **she** had said these thin[gs], **Mary** was silen[t], as the Saviour had spoken   to this point.

Then Andrew answered and said **to the brothers, 'Say what you say** about   what **she** said.   I myself do not believe that the Saviour said such things, for **surely these are** alien **teachings.'**

    Andrew says, '**Brothers, what does it seem to you** abo[u]t what **has been** said? **For** I myself do not believe that t[h]e S[a]viour said such things, f[or] **they seem to** [be di]fferent **from h[is i]dea.**

Peter **answered, he spoke** about such matters. **He asked them about the Saviour,** 'Did **he** speak with a woman secretly, (and) not openly **to us? Are we to turn and** all listen **to her? Did he choose her** over us?'

(Peter said),   **asking** about such matters,   'Did **the Savi[our]** speak secretly with a wo[m]an and not o[p]enly,   so that [we] might all listen? **[Is she m]ore worthy of esteem** than us?

Then Mary wept. She said to Peter, 'My brother Peter, what do you think then? Do you think that I have thought of these (things) myself in my heart, or that I am lying about the Saviour?'

\--
\--
\--
\-- of the Saviour?'

Levi **answered,** he said to Peter, 'Peter, you are always **wrathful! I see you** now disputing with the woman like **the adversaries.**   If the Saviour made her worthy, who are you to reject her?   Surely the Saviour knew her infallibly, and therefore he loved her **more than us.** Rather, let us be ashamed and   **put on** the Perfect Man **and acquire him for ourselves as he** commanded us and preach the gospel, **not** laying down **other rules** or **another** la[w] **beyond what** the Saviour said.'

Lev[i]   says to Peter, 'Peter, **wrath** is always with yo[u], **and so** now you are disputing with the woman like **an adversary to her.** If the Saviour deemed her worthy who are you to reject her? **For** surely he, knowing her i[n]fallib[ly],   loved (her).   Rath[e]r, l[et] us be as[h]amed and **having put on** the P[erfec]t Man, **let [u]s do what was** comm[an]ded us, to pre[ach the] gos[p]el, la[yi]ng down **nothing** [n]or law-**making,**   as   [the] Saviour sai[d].

[When] [........]   and **they** began to **depart [to tea]ch and** to preach. [The Gos]pel according to Mary.

When he had said [the]se things **Levi** dep[arted] and **he** began to p[reach. The Gosp]el [according to Mary.]

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Philosophical Sources

Bury, R. G., trans. *Plato: Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles*. LCL 234. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Fowler, H. N., trans. *Plato: Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. LCL 36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers: Translations of the Principal Sources with Philosophical Commentary*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Coptic Nag Hammadi, Berlin Codex, Codex Tchacos, Pistis Sophia

Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi Section: Textes. 38 vols., Québec and Louvain: Les Presses de l'Université Laval

Kasser, Rodolphe, and Gregor Wurst. *The Gospel of Judas, Critical Edition: Together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos*. Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2007.

Robinson, James M. *The Coptic Gnostic Library*. 5 vols., NHS, Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Schmidt, Carl. *Pistis Sophia*. Translated by Violet MacDermot. NHMS 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Apocalypse of Peter

Elliott, J. K. 'The Apocalypse of Peter' in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 593–612.

Buchholz, Dennis D. *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter*. SBLDS 97. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.

Kraus, Thomas J., and Nicklas, Tobias, *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2004

Epistula Apostolorum

Elliott, J. K. 'The Epistle of the Apostles (Epistula Apostolorum)' in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 555–88.

Guerrier, Louis (with Sylvain Grébaut), *Le Testament en Galilée de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, Patrologia Orientalis, Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1913 (repr. Turnhout: Brepols, 1982).

Schmidt, Carl, and Isaak Wajnberg. *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung; ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts*. TU 43. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919.

Other Ancient Sources

Bardy, Gustave, ed., Jean Sender, trans., *Théophile d'Antioche: Trois Livres à Autolycus*. SC 20. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1948.

Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Ehrman, Bart D., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. LOEB 24. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Graf, Fritz, and Sarah Iles Johnston. *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998. Rousseau, Adelin, Louis Doutreleau, and Charles Mercier, eds. *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 1*. SC 152–53. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

Quispel, G. *Ptolémée. Lettre à Flora: Texte, Traduction et Introduction*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1949.

Stählin, O., L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, eds. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 3rd ed. 4 vols., GCS, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960–80

Whittaker, Molly, ed. and trans., *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Secondary Literature

Adams, Edward. *The Stars Will Fall From Heaven: Cosmic Catastrophe in the New Testament and Its World*. LNTS 347. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2007.

———. *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

Adams, Sean A. *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography*. SNTSMS 156. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Ashton, John. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Attridge, Harold W. 'Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel'. *JBL* 121, no. 1 (2002): 3–21.

———. '"Let Us Strive to Enter That Rest": The Logic of Hebrews 4:1–11'. *HTR* 73, no. 1–2 (1980): 279–88.

Baird, William. 'Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1–5 and Gal 1:11–17'. *JBL* 104, no. 4 (1985): 651–62.

Bass, Ardyth L. *Composition and Redaction in the Coptic Gospel of Mary*. Milwaukee, WI: PhD Thesis, Marquette University, 2007.

Bauckham, Richard. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. 'Pseudo-Apostolic Letters'. *JBL* 107, no. 3 (1988): 469–94.

———. 'The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter'. *JBL* 104, no. 2 (1985): 269–87.

Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.

Beavis, Mary Ann. 'The Power of Jesus' Parables: Were They Polemical or Irenic?' *JSNT* 82 (2001): 3–30.

———. *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11–12*. JSNTSupp 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Bernabé, Alberto, and Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal. *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 162. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 2: 9:51–24:53*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996.

Bockmuehl, Markus. *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*. Interpretation. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017.

Bockmuehl, Markus, and Donald A. Hagner, eds., *The Written Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Boer, Esther A. de. 'A Stoic Reading of the Gospel of Mary: The Meaning of "Matter" and "Nature" in the Gospel of Mary 7.1–8.11'. In *Stoicism in Early Christianity*, edited by Tuomas Rasimus, Ismo Dunderberg, and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 199–219. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.

———. *The Gospel of Mary: Listening to the Beloved Disciple*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. 5th ed. Nashville, TN and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Bovon, François. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013

———. 'Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840, Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity'. *JBL* 119, no. 4 (2000): 705–28.

Brakke, David. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

———. 'Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James'. *JECS* 7, no. 2 (1999): 187–218.

Brayford, Susan. *Genesis*. SEPT. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

Bremmer, Jan N. 'Descents to Hell and Ascents to Heaven in Apocalyptic Literature'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 340–57. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Brock, Ann Graham. *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1988.

———. *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.

———. *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New York: Yale University Press, 1970.

———. 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel'. *NTS* 13, no. 2 (1967): 113–32.

Burke, Tony. 'Early Christian Apocrypha in Contemporary Theological Discourse'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha*, edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 441–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Burkitt, F. C. 'Pistis Sophia Again'. *JTS* 26, no. 104 (1925): 391–99.

Burridge, Richard A. 'Who Writes, Why, and for Whom?' In *The Written Gospel*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner, 99–115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography, SNTSMS 70.f Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Cameron, Ron. *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster John Knox Press, 1982.

Carleton Paget, James, and Judith Lieu, eds. *Christianity in the Second Century: Themes and Developments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Chandler, Daniel. 'An Introduction to Genre Theory', 2000 [1997], 2. Available from http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.pdf

Clark, Elizabeth A. 'From Patristics to Early Christian Studies'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, 7–40. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Supplements to The Journal for the Study of Judaism 50. Leiden and New York: Brill, 1996.

Collins, John J. 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre'. Edited by John J. Collins. *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20.

Collins, Raymond F. *Second Corinthians*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.

Colpe, C. 'Die Himmelsreise der Seele ausserhalb und innerhalb der Gnosis'. In *Le origini dello gnosticismo, Colloquia di Messina 13–18 aprile 1966*, edited by U. Bianchi, 429–47. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Comfort, Philip. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism*. Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2005.

Copenhaver, Brian P. *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation with Notes and Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Corrigan, Kevin, and Tuomas Rasimus, eds. *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*. NHMS 82. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013.

Creech, David. *The Use of Scripture in the Apocryphon of John: A Diachronic Analysis of the Variant Versions*. WUNT II 441. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Crum, W. E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "'I Have Seen the Lord": Mary Magdalen as Visionary, Early Christian Prophecy, and the Context of John 20:14–18'. In *Mariam, the Magdalen, and the Mother*, edited by Deirdre Good, 95–122. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Davies, J. G. 'The Primary Meaning of Παράκλητος'. *JTS* 4, no. 1 (1953): 35–38.

Davies, Stevan. 'The Christology and Protology of the "Gospel of Thomas"'. *JBL* 111, no. 4 (1992): 663–82.

Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *Matthew 8–18*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. ICC. London and New York: T&T Clark, 1991.

DeConick, April D. *Holy Misogyny: Why the Sex and Gender Conflicts in the Early Church Still Matter*. New York and London: Continuum, 2011.

———, ed. *The Codex Judas Papers: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex Held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.

———. *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*. LNTS 287. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

———. *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*. VCSupp 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

———. 'The "Dialogue of the Savior" and the Mystical Sayings of Jesus'. *VC* 50, no. 2 (1996): 178–99.

Denzey Lewis, Nicola. *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Under Pitiless Skies*. NHMS 81. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013.

———. *Introduction to 'Gnosticism': Ancient Voices, Christian Worlds*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Derrida, Jacques. 'The Law of Genre'. *Glyph* 7 (1980): 176–232.

Desjardins, Michel Robert. *Sin in Valentinianism*. SBLDS 108. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Dettwiler, Andreas. *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten: eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31–16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Diehl, Judith A. 'What Is a "Gospel"? Recent Studies in the Gospel Genre'. *Currents in Biblical Research* 9, no. 2 (2011): 171–99.

Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Revised. New York: Cornell University Press, 1996.

———. 'The Descent of the Soul in Middle Platonic and Gnostic Theory'. In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, March 28–31, 1978*, edited by Bentley Layton, Vol. 1. Studies in the History of Religion 41. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Donaldson, Terence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSupp 8. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

Dunderberg, Ismo. 'Secrecy in the Gospel of John'. In *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices*, edited by Christian H. Bull, Liv Ingeborg Leid, and John D. Turner, 221–44. NHMS 76. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict? Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dunning, Benjamin H. 'What Sort of Thing Is This Luminous Woman? Thinking Sexual Difference in On the Origin of the World'. *JECS* 16, no. 1 (2009): 55–84.

Edmonds III, Radcliffe G. *Redefining Ancient Orphism: A Study in Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

———. *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic Gold Tablets'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Edwards, Robert Michael. 'The Rhetoric of Authority: The Nature of Revelation in the First Apocalypse of James'. In *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse*, edited by Marie-Pierre Bussières, 65–79. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Peter, Paul, and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in History and Legend*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ehrman, Bart, and Zlatko Plese. *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Emmel, S. L., Helmut Koester, and Elaine Hiesey Pagels. *Nag Hammadi Codex III,5: The Dialogue of the Savior*. NHS 26. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Epp, Eldon Jay. 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism'. *HTR* 92, no. 3 (1999): 245–81.

Evans, Craig A. 'Jesus in Gnostic Literature'. *Biblica* 62, no. 3 (1981): 406–12.

Evans, Erin. *The Books of Jeu and the Pistis Sophia as Handbooks to Eternity: Exploring the Gnostic Mysteries of the Ineffable*. NHMS 89. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.

Falkenberg, René. 'Matthew 28:16–20 and the Nag Hammadi Library: Reception of the Great Commission in the Sophia of Jesus Christ'. In *Mark and Matthew II: Comparative Readings, Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, edited by Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson, 93–104. WUNT 304. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Fallon, Francis T. 'Gnostic Apocalypses'. Edited by John J. Collins. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, *Semeia* 14 (1979): 123–58.

———. 'The Law in Philo and Ptolemy: A Note on the Letter to Flora'. *VC* 30, no. 1 (1976): 45–51.

Ferreira, Johan. *Johannine Ecclesiology*. LNTS 160. Sheffield: T&T Clark, 1998.

Foster, Paul. 'The Gospel of Philip'. In *The Non-Canonical Gospels*, edited by Paul Foster, 68–83. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

———. 'Polymorphic Christology: Its Origins and Development in Early Christianity'. *JTS* 58, no. 1 (2007): 66–99.

Frey, Jörg. 'Das Freer-Logion'. In *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Band in zwei Teilbänden: Evangelien und Verwandtes*, edited by Christoph Markschies and Jens Schröter, 2:1059–61. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

———. 'Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion'. *ZNW* 93, no. 1–2 (2002): 13–34.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*. ABC 28A. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002.

Fuller, Reginald H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980.

Gathercole, Simon. *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*. TENT 11. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014.

———. '"The Heavens and Earth Will Be Rolled Up": The Eschatology of the Gospel of Thomas'. In *Eschatologie – Eschatology. The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 2009)*, edited by Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser, and Hermann Lichtenberger, 280–302. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

———. 'Quis et Unde? Heavenly Obstacles in Gos. Thom. 50 and Related Literature'. In *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa, 82–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. *The Gospel of Judas: Rewriting Early Christianity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Glaser, Timo. 'Liaisons Dangereuses: Epistolary Novels in Antiquity'. In *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne, 244–56. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chicester and Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Goodacre, Mark. *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.

Gregory, Andrew. 'Non-Canonical Epistles and Related Literature'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Christopher Tuckett and Andrew Gregory, 90–114. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. Library of Theological Translations. Cambridge: James Clarke Co., 2002.

Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Harnack, Adolf. 'Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus (I Kor. 15, 3ff) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Petrus'. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1922): 62–80.

Hartenstein, Judith. 'Erscheinungsevangelien (Gespräche mit dem Auferstandenen) im Kontext frühchristlicher Theologie: Anknüpfungspunkte und Besonderheiten der christologischen Vorstellungen'. In *The Apocryphal Gospels within the Context of Early Christian Theology*, edited by Jens Schröter, 305–32. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.

———. 'Dialogische Evangelien'. In *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Band in zwei Teilbänden: Evangelien und Verwandtes.*, edited by Christoph Markschies and Jens Schröter, Vol. 1. Pt 2., 1051–59. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

———. *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge.* TU 146. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

Haxby, Mikael. 'The First Apocalypse of James: Martyrdom and Sexual Difference'. PhD Thesis, Harvard, 2013.

Hedrick, Charles W. 'Kingdom Sayings and Parables of Jesus in the Apocryphon of James: Tradition and Redaction'. *NTS* 29, no. 1 (1983): 1–24.

Helmer, Robert C. '"That We May Know and Understand": Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter'. PhD Thesis, Marquette University, 1998.

Hengel, Martin. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ.* Translated by John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 2000)

Hennecke, E., and W. Schneemelcher, eds. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Evangelien.* 3rd ed. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959.

Hill, Charles E. 'A Four-Gospel Canon in the Second Century? Artifact and Arti-Fiction'. *EC* 4 (2013): 310–34.

Hills, Julian V. *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum.* HTS 57. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

———. 'Parables, Pretenders, and Prophecies: Translation and Interpretation in the Apocalypse of Peter 2'. *Revue Biblique* 98, no. 4 (1991): 560–73.

Himmelfarb, Martha. 'The Experience of the Visionary and Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6–11 and the Apocalypse of Paul'. *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, *Semeia* 36 (1986): 97–112.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. 'The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus: The Case of Eschatology'. In *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*, edited by A. Hilhorst and G. H. van Kooten, 381–96. AGJU 59. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Hornschuh, Manfred. *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum.* Patristische Texte und Studien 5. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965.

Hubbard, Benjamin J. *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16–20.* Missoula, MT: SBL Scholars Press, 1974.

Hurtado, Larry W. 'The Greek Fragments of "The Gospel of Thomas" as Artefacts: Papyrological Observations on P. Oxy. 1, P.Oxy 654, and P. Oxy 655'. In *Das*

Thomasevangelium: Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie, edited by Jörg Frey, Enno Edzard Popkes, and Jens Schröter, 19–32. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2008.

———. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Iricinschi, Eduard. 'Scribes and Readers of Nag Hammadi Codex II: Book Production and Monastic Paideia in Fourth-Century Egypt'. PhD Thesis, Princeton, 2009.

Jakab, A. 'The Reception of the Apocalypse of Peter in Ancient Christianity', in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz, 174–86. Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 7. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Janssen, Martina. 'Mystagogus Gnosticus? Zur Gattung der "gnostischen Gespräche des Auferstandenen"'. In *Studien zur Gnosis*, edited by Gerd Lüdemann, 21–260. Studies in the Religion and History of Early Christianity. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999.

Jenott, Lance. 'Reading Variants in James and the Apocalypse of James: A Perspective from New Philology'. In *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, edited by Liv Ingeborg Leid and Hugo Lundhaug, 55–84. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

———. *The Gospel of Judas: Coptic Text, Translation, and Historical Interpretation of 'the Betrayer's Gospel'*. STAC 64. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Jenott, Lance, and Elaine Pagels. 'Antony's Letters and Nag Hammadi Codex I: Sources of Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt'. *JECS* 18, no. 4 (2010): 557–589.

Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. SNTSMS 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Kaler, Michael. 'Just How Close Are the Gnostic Revelation Dialogues to Erotapokriseis Literature, Anyway?' In *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse*, edited by Marie-Pierre Bussières, 37–49. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013.

Kazen, Thomas. 'Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts'. *NTS* 51, no. 4 (2005): 561–78.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.

Kelhoffer, James A. 'The Witness of Eusebius's ad Marinum and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates Concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark's Gospel'. In his *Conceptions of 'Gospel' and Legitimacy in Early Christianity*, 121–64. WUNT 324. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

King, Karen L. 'The Place of the Gospel of Philip in the Context of Early Christian Claims about Jesus' Marital Status'. *NTS* 59, no. 4 (2013): 565–87.

———. 'Mystery and Secrecy in The Secret Revelation of John'. In *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices*, edited by Christian H. Bull, Liv Ingeborg Leid, and John D. Turner, 61–86. NHMS 76. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.

———. 'Marytrdom and Its Discontents in the Tchacos Codex'. In *The Codex Judas Papers: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex Held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008*, edited by April D. DeConick, 23–42. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.

———. *The Secret Revelation of John*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

———. *What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.

———. *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2003.

———. 'Hearing, Seeing, and Knowing God: Allogenes and the Gospel of Mary'. In *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*, edited by David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, and David W. Pao, 319–32. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. 'Why All the Controversy? Mary in the Gospel of Mary'. In *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*, edited by F. Stanley Jones, 53–74. SBL Symposium Series 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

———. 'Prophetic Power and Women's Authority: The Case of the Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)'. In *Women Preachers and Prophets Through Two Millennia of Christianity*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker, 21–41. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1998.

———. 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene'. In *Searching the Scriptures, II: A Feminist Commentary*, edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 601–34. New York: Crossroad, 1994.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *The Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction*. Translated by Brian McNeil. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Knight, Jonathan. 'The Origin and Significance of the Angelomorphic Christology in the Ascension of Isaiah'. *JTS* 63, no. 1 (2012): 66–105.

Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. 2 vols. New York and Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

———. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.

———. 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century'. In *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, edited by William L. Peterson, 19–37. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.

———. 'One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels'. Edited by James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester. *HTR* 61, no. 2 (1968): 203–47.

Koester, Helmut, and Elaine Pagels. 'Introduction'. In *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*, 1–19. NHS 26. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Koschorke, Klaus. 'Eine gnostische Paraphrase des johanneischen Prologs: zur Interpretation von "Epistula Petri ad Philippum" (NHC VIII, 2) 136,16–137,4'. *VC* 33, no. 4 (1979): 383–92.

Krause, Martin. 'Die literarischen Gattungen der Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi'. In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 621–37. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Kruger, Michael J. *The Gospel of the Savior: An Analysis of P.Oxy. 840 and Its Place in the Gospel Traditions of Early Christianity*. TENT 1. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Lang, T. J. *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century*. BZNW 219. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

Lapham, F. *Peter: The Myth, the Man and the Writings: A Study of the Early Petrine Text and Tradition*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Layton, Bentley. 'Ptolemy's Epistle to Flora'. In *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions*, 306–15. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.

Lehtipuu, Outi. *Debates over the Resurrection of the Dead*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*. NovTSupp 123. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

Létourneau, Pierre. 'The Dialogue of the Savior as a Witness to the Late Valentinian Tradition'. *VC* 65, no. 1 (2011): 74–98.

———. *Le Dialogue du Sauveur (NH III,5)*. BCNT:T 29. Louvain: Peeters, 2003.

Liddell, Scott, and Jones, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1843; 9th ed., 1940)

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. World Bible Commentary 42. Waco, TX: Word, 1990.

Lucchesi, E. 'Évangile selon Marie ou Évangile selon Marie-Madeleine?' *Analecta Bollandiana* 103, no. 3–4 (1985): 366.

Lührmann, Dieter. *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien: Studien zu Neuen Texten und zu Neuen Fragen*. NovTSupp 112. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004.

Luijendijk, AnneMarie. 'Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus'. *VC* 64 (2010): 217–54.

Lundhaug, Hugo. *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul*. NHMS 73. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010.

Luttikhuizen, Gerard P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. NHMS 58. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.

———. 'The Suffering Jesus and the Invulnerable Christ in the Gnostic Apocalypse of Peter'. In *The Apocalypse of Peter*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz, 187–99. Studies on the Early Christian Apocrypha 7. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. 'The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues'. *NovT* 30, no. 2 (1988): 158–68.

Marincola, John. 'Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography'. In *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, edited by C. S. Kraus, 281–324. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava: Supplementum 191. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Marjanen, Antti. 'The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts'. In *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*, edited by F. Stanley Jones, 31–42. SBL Symposium Series 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

———. *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*. NHMS 40. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Markschies, Christoph, and Jens Schröter, eds. *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung: Evangelien und Verwandtes*. Vol. 1 Pt. 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Martin, Dale. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 3rd ed. The New Testament Library. Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

May, Gerhard. *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

———. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Meyer, Marvin, and Madeleine Scopello. 'The Wisdom of Jesus Christ'. In *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures: The International Edition*, 283–96. New York: Harper Collins, 2007.

Meyer, Marvin W. *The Letter of Peter to Philip*. SBLDS 53. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Mohri, Erika. *Maria Magdalena: Frauenbilder in Evangelientexten des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts*. Marburger theologische Studien 63. Marburg: Elwert, 2000.

Moore, A. L. *The Parousia in the New Testament*. NovTSupp 13. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Morris, Leon. *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1988.

Muddiman, John. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London and New York: Continuum, 2001.

Nasrallah, Laura Salah. *An Ecstasy of Folly: Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. HTS 52. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

van Os, Bas. 'John's Last Supper and the Resurrection Dialogues'. In *John, Jesus, and History: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel.* Vol. 2, edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, 271–80. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

Osborn, Eric. *Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pagels, Elaine H. *The Gnostic Gospels*. New York: Random House, 1979.

———. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975.

———. '"The Mystery of the Resurrection": A Gnostic Reading of 1 Corinthians 15'. *JBL* 93, no. 2 (1974): 276–88.

Parker, David C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Parkhouse, Sarah. 'The Fetishization of Female Exempla: Mary, Thecla, Perpetua and Felicitas'. *NTS* 63, no. 4 (2017): 567–87.

Parrott, D. M. *Nag Hammadi Codices III,3–4 and V,1, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081: Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ*. Leiden and New York: Brill, 1991.

Parsons, P. J. '3525: Gospel of Mary' In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 12–14. Graeco-Roman Memoirs, Vol. 50 70. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.

Pasquier, Anne. *L'Évangile selon Marie*. BCNT:T 10. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1983.

———. 'L'eschatologie dans l'Évangile selon Marie: étude des notions de nature et d'image'. In *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22–25 août 1978)*, edited by Bernard Barc, 390–404. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1981.

Pearson, Birger A. *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Peel, Malcolm L. 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament'. *NovT* 12, no. 2 (1970): 141–65.

Penn, Michael Philip. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Perkins, Pheme. *Gnosticism and the New Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.

———. 'Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas. (NHC 1,2)'. *JBL* 101, no. 3 (1982): 403–14.

———. 'Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament'. *CBQ* 43, no. 4 (1981): 590–607.

———. *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.

Petersen, Silke. *Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit! Maria Magdalena, Salome and andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften*. NHMS 48. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Pétrement, Simone. *A Separate God: The Origins and Teachings of Gnosticism*. Translated by Carol Harrison. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1984.

Piovanelli, Pierluigi. 'Entre oralité et (ré)écriture: Le modèle des Erotapokriseis dans les dialogues Apocryphes de Nag Hammadi'. In *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse*, edited by Marie-Pierre Bussières, 93–103. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013.

Pleše, Zlatko. *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John*. NHMS 52. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.

Popkes, Enno Edzard. 'Von der Eschatologie zur Protologie: Transformationen apokalyptischer Motive im koptischen Thomasevangelium'. In *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie*, edited by Michael Becker and Markus Öhler, 211–34. WUNT II 214. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Puech, Henri-Charles, and Beate Blatz. 'The Gospel of Mary'. In *New Testament Apocrypha*, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, translated by R. McL. Wilson, 2nd ed., 1:391–95. Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Ramelli, Ilaria. *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*. VCSupp 120. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Rasimus, Tuomas, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Ismo Dunderberg, eds. *Stoicism in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997.

Roberts, C. H. '463: The Gospel of Mary'. In *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, 18–23. 3. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938.

Robinson, James M. 'Jesus from Easter to Valentinus (Or to the Apostles' Creed)'. *JBL* 101, no. 1 (1982): 5–37.

Robinson, James M. and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971).

Roy, Louise, and Donald Rouleau. *L'Épître apocryphe de Jacques (NH I,2) suivi de l'Acte de Pierre (BG 4)*. BCNT:T 18. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987.

Rudolph, Kurt. 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als Literarisches Genus'. In *Probleme Der Koptischen Literatur*, edited by Peter Nagel, 85–107. Halle: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge der Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1968.

Schaberg, Jane. *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene: Legends, Apocrypha, and the Christian Testament*. London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to John: Commentary on Chapters 13–21*. Vol. 3. Translated by David Smith and G. A. Kon. Kent: Burns & Oates, 1988.

Schenke, Hans-Martin. 'Function and Background of the Beloved Disciple'. In *Der Same Seths: Hans-Martin Schenkes Kleine Schriften zu Gnosis, Koptologie und Neuem Testament*, edited by Gesine Schenke Robinson, Gesa Schenke, and Uwe-Karsten Plisch, 598–613. NHMS 78. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.

Schenke Robinson, Gesine. 'The Relationship of the Gospel of Judas to the New Testament and to Sethianism'. *Journal of Coptic Studies* 10 (2008): 63–98.

Schmidt, Carl. *Pistis Sophia*. Translated by Violet MacDermot. NHMS 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Schneemelcher, W. *New Testament Apocrypha: Gospels and Related Writings*. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. 6th ed. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.

Schneider, C. 'Anapausis'. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* I (1950): 414–18.

Schröter, Jens. 'Zur Menschensohnvorstellung im Evangelium nach Maria'. In *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996. Band 2 Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*, edited by Stephen Emmel, Martin Krause, Siegfried G. Richter, and Sofia Schaten, 178–88. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 1999.

Shepherd, Thomas R. 'Narrative Analysis as a Text Critical Tool: Mark 16 in Codex W as a Test Case'. *JSNT* 32, no. 1 (2009): 77–98.

Shisha-Halevy, Ariel. 'Future, Present, Narrative Past: a Triple Note on Oxyrhynchite Tempuslehre'. *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft* 35, no. 3 (2003): 249–309.

Shoemaker, Stephen J. 'Rethinking the "Gnostic Mary": Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition'. *JECS* 9, no. 4 (2001): 555–95.

Siker, Jeffrey S. 'The Parousia of Jesus in Second- and Third-Century Christianity'. In *The Return of Jesus in Early Christianity*, edited by John T. Carroll, 147–67. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

Smith, Daniel Lynwood, and Zachary Lundin Kostopoulos. 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts'. *NTS* 63, no. 3 (2017): 390–410.

Stanton, Graham N. *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Strawbridge, Jennifer R. *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*. SBR 5. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

Stroumsa, Guy G. *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions And The Roots Of Christian Mysticism*. 2nd ed. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

Suciu, Alin. *The Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon: A Coptic Apostolic Memoir*, WUNT 370 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

Talbert, Charles H. *Ephesians and Colossians*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation; Volume 1, The Gospel according to Luke*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986.

Tardieu, Michel. *Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984.

Tardieu, Michel, and Jean-Daniel Dubois. *Introduction à la littérature gnostique. I: Collections retrouvées avant 1945*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986.

Tervahauta, Ulla. *A Story of the Soul's Journey in the Nag Hammadi Library: A Study of Authentikos Logos (NHC VI,3)*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

Thielman, Frank. *Ephesians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.

Thomassen, Einar. 'Gnostics and Orphics'. In *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer*, edited by Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper, 463–74. Studies in the History of Religions 127. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010.

———. *The Spiritual Seed. The Church of the Valentinians*. NHMS 60. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.

Till, Walter C., and Hans-Martin Schenke. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*. 2nd ed. TU 60. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972.

Tite, Philip L. *Valentinian Ethics and Paraenetic Discourse: Determining the Social Function of Moral Exhortation in Valentinian Christianity*. NHMS 67. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 'The Origin of Genres'. In *Modern Genre Theory*, edited by David Duff, 193–209. New York: Longman, 2000.

Trevett, Christine. 'Prophets, Economics, and the Rites of Man'. In *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity*, edited by Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas, 43–64. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Tuckett, Christopher. *The Gospel of Mary*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. 'Forty Other Gospels'. In *The Written Gospel*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner, 238–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. '"Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?' In *Biblical Canons*, edited by J. M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, 431–58. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. *Nag Hammadi and The Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.

———. 'Synoptic Tradition in Some Nag Hammadi and Related Texts'. *VC* 36, no. 2 (1982): 173–90.

Turner, John D. *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*. BCNT:E 6. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001.

———. *The Book of Thomas the Contender from Codex II of the Cairo Gnostic Library from Nag Hammadi (CG II, 7): The Coptic Text with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. SBLDS 23. Missoula, MT: SBL Scholars Press, 1975.

van Unnik, W. C. 'The Origin of the Recently Discovered "Apocryphon Jacobi"'. *VC* 10, no. 3 (1956): 149–56.

Vliet, Jacques van der. 'Fate, Magic and Astrology in Pistis Sophia, Chaps 15–21'. In *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*, edited by A. Hilhorst and G. H. van Kooten, 519–36. AGJU 59. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

———. 'Spirit and Prophecy in the Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha (NHC I,2)'. *VC* 44, no. 1 (1990): 25–53.

Watson, Francis. 'A Gospel of the Eleven: The Epistula Apostolorum and the Johannine Tradition'. In *Connecting Gospels: Beyond the Canonical/Non-Canonical Divide*, edited by Francis Watson and Sarah Parkhouse. Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

———. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

Welburn, A. J. 'The Identity of the Archons in the "Apocryphon Johannis"'. *VC* 32, no. 4 (1978): 241–54.

Williams, F. E. 'The Apocryphon of James (I, 2)'. In *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, edited by James M. Robinson, 29–31. Leiden and New York: Brill, 1996.

Williams, Michael A. 'Secrecy, Revelation, and Late Antique Demiurgical Myths'. In *Rending the Veil: Concealment and Secrecy in the History of Religions*, edited by Elliot R. Wolfson, 31–58. New York: Seven Bridges Press, 1999.

———. *Rethinking 'Gnosticism': An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

———. *The Immovable Race: A Gnostic Designation and the Theme of Stability in Late Antiquity*. NHS 29. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Wilmet, M. *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique, II. Les mots autochtones, 3*. CSCO 185. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1959.

Wilson, R. McL. *The Gospel of Philip: Translated from the Coptic Text, with an Introduction and Commentary*. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co, 1962.

———. 'The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary'. *NTS* 3, no. 3 (1957): 236–43.

Wilson, R. McL., and George W. MacRae. 'The Gospel According to Mary: BG, 1:7,1–19,5'. In *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berlinensis 8502,1 and 4.*, edited by D. M. Parrott, 453–71. NHS 11. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Wisse, Frederick. 'The Coptic Versions of the New Testament'. In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 131–41. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

Woll, D. Bruce. 'The Departure of "The Way": The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John'. *JBL* 99, no. 2 (1980): 225–39.

Wolters, Al. 'Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10'. *Westminster Theological Journal* 49 (1987): 405–13.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Zamagni, Claudio. 'Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogeneous Group?' In *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l'enseignement à l'exégèse*, edited by Marie-Pierre Bussières, 241–68. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013.

Zelyck, Lorne R. *John among the Other Gospels: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Extra-Canonical Gospels*. WUNT II 347. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.